

*Proposed District Plan*

**SUBMISSION SUMMARIES**

**BY CHAPTER**

# Table of Contents

## Part 1 – Introduction and General Provisions

Contents.....	1
Purpose.....	2
Description of the District.....	3
Statutory Context.....	5
General Approach.....	8
Definitions.....	10
Abbreviations.....	43
National Policy Statements and NZCPS.....	44
National Environmental Standards.....	45
Tangata Whenua – Mana Whenua.....	46

## Part 2 – District Wide Matters

Strategic Direction – Historic and Cultural Heritage.....	47
Strategic Direction – Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change.....	48
Strategic Direction – Tangata whenua.....	53
Strategic Direction – Urban Form and Development.....	54
Financial Contributions.....	59
Network Utilities.....	61
Renewable Energy.....	101
Stormwater.....	105
Transport.....	118
Genetically Modified Organisms.....	141
Hazardous Substances.....	142
Natural Hazards.....	149
Papakainga.....	150
Historic Heritage.....	154
Notable Trees.....	163
Sites of Significance to Maori.....	166
Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay.....	167
Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay.....	170
Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay.....	173
Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay.....	177
Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay.....	179
Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay.....	185
Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay.....	188
Iron Pot Historic Heritage Overlay.....	191
Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity.....	195
Natural Features and Landscapes.....	196
Public Access.....	205
Subdivision.....	208
Activities on the Surface of Water.....	234
Coastal Environment.....	237
Earthworks.....	248
Light.....	259
Noise.....	266
Signs.....	310
Temporary Activities.....	317

## Part 3 – Area-Specific Matters

General Residential Zone.....	320
Large Lot Residential Zone.....	334
Medium Density Residential Zone.....	340
High Density Residential Zone.....	385
Harbour Reserve Amenity Precinct.....	415
Mission Residential Precinct.....	416
Napier Hill Mataruahou Amenity Precinct.....	417
Rural Lifestyle Zone.....	418
Rural Production Zone.....	434
Settlement Zone.....	456
Rural Specific Control Area.....	461
Jervoistown Precinct.....	462

Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct.....	464
Mission Productive Rural Precinct.....	472
Mission Rural Residential Precinct.....	473
Neighbourhood Centre Zone.....	475
Local Centre Zone.....	480
Large Format Retail Zone.....	487
Mixed Use Zone.....	492
Town Centre Zone.....	504
City Centre Zone.....	510
Foreshore Commercial Precinct.....	514
Napier City Heritage Precinct.....	515
West Quay Waterfront Precinct.....	516
Light Industrial Zone.....	517
General Industrial Zone.....	527
Natural Open Space Zones.....	546
Open Space Zones.....	555
Sport and Active Recreation Zone.....	565
Te Whanganui a Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Treatment Zone.....	575
Airport Zone.....	585
Marine Industrial Zone.....	617
Maori Purpose Zone.....	618
Port Zone.....	620
Stadium Zone.....	627
Tertiary Education Zone.....	637
Wastewater Treatment Zone.....	638
Te Awa Development Area.....	639
Wharerangi Road Development Area.....	640
Mission Development Area.....	645
Designations – HBAL – Hawke’s Bay Airport Limited.....	649
Designations – KRHL – KiwiRail Holdings Limited.....	651
Designations – MEDU – Ministry of Education.....	652
Designations – NZTA – New Zealand Transport Agency.....	653
Designations – TPR – Transpower New Zealand Limited.....	654

#### **Part 4 – Schedules and Appendices**

Notable Trees.....	655
Schedule of Natural Features and Landscapes.....	656
Historic Heritage Items.....	657
Historic Heritage Overlay and Precinct Schedule.....	661
Archaeological Sites.....	662
Amenity Precinct Values and Attributes Statements.....	663
Airport Height Control Designation.....	664
Redclyffe Substation 12m Setback.....	665
Access Site Distance Lines.....	666
Port Noise Management Plan.....	667
Port Noise Mitigation Requirements.....	670
Mission Special Character Zone Structure Plan – Overall map.....	676
Mission Special Character Zone Structure Plan – Area plan map.....	677
Financial Contributions Tables.....	678
Financial Contributions Areas.....	679
Roading Hierarchy.....	680

#### **Other Submissions**

General.....	681
Planning Maps.....	687

# Contents

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
<p>Contents /Contents /Hazards and Risks                      GMO - Genetically Modified Organisms and Genetic Engineering                      HAZS - Hazardous substances                      NH - Natural Hazards</p>	Georgina McPherson	215.74	Oppose	<p>Given the NESCS itself does not contain any objectives or policies, the Fuel Companies consider it would be appropriate to include a policy framework in the Proposed Plan to provide guidance on the assessment of applications that require consent under the NESCS, particularly those that require a discretionary activity consent under the NESCS. The Fuel Companies seek the inclusion of a policy framework relating to contaminated land. The NESCS provides appropriate land use controls in relation to both land disturbance and changes of use in relation to contaminated soils and therefore supports the Proposed Plan having no rules in relation to contaminated land. This could be achieved by carrying over Objective 64.2 and Policies 64.2.1 and 64.2.2 from the Operative Napier District Plan which are fit for purpose.</p>	<p>Include a new Contaminated Land Chapter in the 'Hazards and Risks' section in Part 2 – District-Wide Matters of the Proposed Plan, with objectives and policies (but no rules).</p> <p><u>Objectives:</u>                      There are no significant risks to human health posed by residual soil contaminant levels in land that has a history of land use which may have resulted in contamination.</p> <p><u>Policies:</u>                      Ensure that before any development, redevelopment or change of land use on land that has a history of land use that may have resulted in contamination, associated health risks are appropriately identified and managed. Any change of land use, development or redevelopment on contaminated land ensures that any proposed management controls, including remediation, pathway or receptor controls, will ensure the risks to human health are acceptable for the intended land use.</p>	Open Submission

# Purpose

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Purpose	Sera Chambers	150.49	Oppose	Opposes the PDP as the RMA is being replaced and any sections of the PDP that references the RMA; Natural and Built Environment Act 2023; Spatial Planning Act 2023 or other repealed legislation will need to be consulted upon again as the information in the current version of the Plan may not fit new legislative requirements. This potentially affects all applicable sections within Part 1 - Introduction and General Provisions, Part 2 - District-Wide Matters, Part 3 - Area Specific Matters and Part 4 - Schedules and Appendices. Central Government plans to legislate to make the Medium Density Standards (MDRS) optional for Councils together with a comprehensive review of all legislation. This includes: "The Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi" and the replacement of all such references with specific words relating to the relevance and application of The Treaty or else repealing the references; amending Section 58 of the Marine and Coastal Area Act to make clear Parliament's original intent; streamlining the Plan preparation process in Schedule 1 of the RMA amongst proposed changes.	Seeks to delete the current version of the Proposed Napier District Plan (PDP).	Open Submission

# Description of the District

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Description of the District /Description of the District	Maria Roberts	219.1	Amend	Submitter would like the population information to include disabled people, as per Napier City Council Disability Strategy.	Seeks to amend the description of the district to include disabled people. More details are provided in the full submission.	Open Submission
Description of the District /Ahuriri Napier – our city /The famous Marine Parade serves as a scenic and popular bridge between the city and the Pacific Ocean, with family-centred activities that provide hours of entertainment for children and parents. Napier's largest industry sectors in gross domestic product terms are commercial and business services, wholesale, retail and hospitality services, processing and manufacturing, and health, education, and community services.	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.2	Support	Supports the PDP Part 1 - Introduction and general Provisions / Introduction / Description of the District / Ahuriri Napier - our city which states that: Napier's largest industry sectors in gross domestic product terms are commercial and business services, wholesale, retail and hospitality services, processing and manufacturing, and health, education, and community services. Ravensdown has its Napier Works and two bulk stores within the city and as such supports the recognition of the wholesale and manufacturing industry sectors.	Retain the seventh paragraph about Napier's largest industry sectors in the Description of the District / Ahuriri Napier - our city in its entirety.	Open Submission
Description of the District /Ahuriri Napier – our city /The famous Marine Parade serves as a scenic and popular bridge between the city and the Pacific Ocean, with family-centred activities that provide hours of entertainment for children and parents. Napier's largest industry sectors in gross domestic product terms are commercial and business services, wholesale, retail and hospitality services, processing and manufacturing, and health, education, and community services.	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.2	Support	Supports the PDP Part 1 - Introduction and general Provisions / Introduction / Description of the District / Ahuriri Napier - our city which states that: Napier's largest industry sectors in gross domestic product terms are commercial and business services, wholesale, retail and hospitality services, processing and manufacturing, and health, education, and community services. Ravensdown has its Napier Works and two bulk stores within the city and as such supports the recognition of the wholesale and manufacturing industry sectors.	Retain the seventh paragraph about Napier's largest industry sectors in the Description of the District / Ahuriri Napier - our city in its entirety.	Open Submission
Description of the District /Description of the District /The famous Marine Parade serves as a scenic and popular bridge between the city and the Pacific Ocean, with family-centred activities that provide hours of entertainment for children and parents. Napier's largest industry sectors in gross domestic product terms are commercial and business services, wholesale, retail and hospitality services, processing and manufacturing, and health, education, and community services.	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.3	Support	The submitter supports the Description of Our Economy in the Description of the District / Ahuriri Napier - our city Section as Ravensdown, given the presence of its Napier Works and two bulk stores within the city, supports the recognition of wholesale and manufacturing industry sectors as being of importance to the city in the PDP.	Retain the first paragraph, under the heading 'Our economy', which describes Napier's industry sectors, as notified.	Open Submission
Description of the District /Description of the District /The famous Marine Parade serves as a scenic and popular bridge between the city and the Pacific Ocean, with family-centred activities that provide hours of entertainment for children and parents. Napier's largest industry sectors in gross domestic product terms are commercial and business services, wholesale, retail and hospitality services, processing and manufacturing, and health, education, and community services.	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.3	Support	The submitter supports the Description of Our Economy in the Description of the District / Ahuriri Napier - our city Section as Ravensdown, given the presence of its Napier Works and two bulk stores within the city, supports the recognition of wholesale and manufacturing industry sectors as being of importance to the city in the PDP.	Retain the first paragraph, under the heading 'Our economy', which describes Napier's industry sectors, as notified.	Open Submission

# Description of the District

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Description of the District /Ahuriri Napier – our city /Napier has a proud social history as a government-designated Pilot City, an active arts and culture scene, a community sports hub, and a tertiary education centre for the East Coast through the Eastern Institute of Technology - Te Pūkenga.Napier has a low-scale built environment, surrounded by rural areas that provide for rural lifestyles and form an important backdrop to the city, as well as supporting a regional economy that is linked to viticulture, manufacturing, and primary production.	Leanne Roberts	257.15	Amend	Considers paragraph 9 of the description describes the rural areas providing rural lifestyles and also viticulture, manufacturing and primary production. Given the importance of horticulture, it should be specifically listed.	Seeks to amend Para 9 of Description of the District by adding 'horticulture' after viticulture.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Statutory Context /The Resource Management Act 1991	Sera Chambers	150.71	Oppose	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	Open Submission
Statutory Context /The Resource Management Act 1991	Sera Chambers	150.72	Oppose	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	Open Submission
Statutory Context /The Resource Management Act 1991	Sera Chambers	150.73	Oppose	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	Open Submission
Statutory Context /Natural and Built Environments Act 2023 and Spatial Planning Act 2023	Sera Chambers	150.74	Oppose	The Central Government (government) plans to repeal the Natural and Built Environment Act 2023 and the Spatial Planning Act 2023 by Christmas 2023.	Any sections of the PDP that reference these Acts will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	Open Submission
Statutory Context /Statutory and non-statutory documents	Sera Chambers	150.75	Oppose	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	Open Submission
Statutory Context /National level /National policy statements are required under section 52(2) of the RMA to state objectives and policies for matters of national significance. District plans must give effect to national policy statements (section 75(3) (a)-(b) of the RMA).	Sera Chambers	150.76	Oppose	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	Open Submission
Statutory Context /National level /The government can introduce new national policy statements at any time, and this may require changes to the district plan to give effect to them in the future.	Sera Chambers	150.77	Support	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	Open Submission
Statutory Context /National environmental standards	Sera Chambers	150.78	Oppose	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	Open Submission
Statutory Context /National planning standards	Sera Chambers	150.79	Oppose	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	Open Submission



Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Statutory Context /Regional level	Sera Chambers	150.80	Oppose	<p>As mentioned in the PDP, due to the magnitude of Cyclone Gabrielle in February, Council needs to reassess some chapters, and therefore cannot notify the Proposed Plan in full.</p> <p>The following chapters will be notified as a Plan Variation for submissions later in the review process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Sites of Significance to Māori</u></li> <li>- <u>Natural Hazards</u></li> </ul> <p>- Indigenous Biodiversity – this is due to the timing of the release of the new National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and the significant change from the exposure draft, which officers were working off in preparing this chapter.</p> <p>Any sections of the PDP that reference these sections will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not be fit for purpose based on the Plan Variation.</p>	Any sections of the PDP that reference sites of significance to Māori, Natural Hazards, or Indigenous Biodiversity will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not be fit for purpose based on the Plan Variation.	Open Submission
Statutory Context /Local level /Section 74 of the RMA requires the district plan to take into account a range of other plans. This includes management plans and strategies prepared under other acts. Some of these are summarised below.	Sera Chambers	150.81	Oppose	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	Open Submission
Statutory Context /Local level	Sera Chambers	150.82	Oppose	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements. The Annual Plan for 2023-24 has been revised since the initial consultation period. This will need to be consulted on again as the information is not current.	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements. The Annual Plan for 2023- 24 has been revised since the initial consultation period. This will need to be consulted on again as the information is not current.	Open Submission
Statutory Context /Iwi planning documents	Sera Chambers	150.83	Oppose	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	Open Submission
Statutory Context /General	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.1	Amend	The submitter considers there are three high-level 'areas of concern' with the PDP. Namely: whether the PDP should have been notified at this point in time given district-wide gaps within the PDP and the fact that fundamental strategy work is currently taking place; significant restrictions on heavy, or wet, industrial activities from establishing or operating in the General Industrial Zone (GIZ); and the rezoning of land adjoining Ravensdown's Napier Works from Rural Production Zone (RPROZ) to General Industrial Zone (GIZ). (Refer to original submission for full reasons)	Seeks the amendments requested within the submission points in Attachment A to ensure the PDP provides sustainable management or resources, namely that the city's land resource will achieve the purpose of the RMA; is in accordance with Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA; provides for the social and economic well-being of the city's people and communities; meets the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; enables the efficient use and development of Ravensdown's assets and operations; and represents the most appropriate means of exercising Council's functions having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Open Submission

# Statutory Context

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Statutory Context /General	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.1	Amend	The submitter considers there are three high-level 'areas of concern' with the PDP. Namely: whether the PDP should have been notified at this point in time given district-wide gaps within the PDP and the fact that fundamental strategy work is currently taking place; significant restrictions on heavy, or wet, industrial activities from establishing or operating in the General Industrial Zone (GIZ); and the rezoning of land adjoining Ravensdown's Napier Works from Rural Production Zone (RPROZ) to General Industrial Zone (GIZ).(Refer to original submission for full reasons)	Seeks the amendments requested within the submission points in Attachment A to ensure the PDP provides sustainable management or resources, namely that the city's land resource will achieve the purpose of the RMA; is in accordance with Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA; provides for the social and economic well-being of the city's people and communities; meets the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; enables the efficient use and development of Ravensdown's assets and operations; and represents the most appropriate means of exercising Council's functions having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Open Submission
Statutory Context /Heritage New Zealand List/Rarangī Kōrero	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.1	Amend	Considers that the Statutory Context Section description of the New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero which states that the list can include buildings, sites, archaeological sites and wāhi taonga should also refer to wāhi tapu, wāhi tupuna, and wāhi tapu area, not wāhi taonga. In the context of discussing the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act it would be clearer to refer to Section 74 of the RMA, rather than to 'the Act'.	Amend the Statutory Context Section description of the New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero as follows:Heritage New Zealand List / Rārangī Kōrero...The list can include buildings, sites, archaeological sites and <del>wāhi taonga</del> <u>wāhi tapu, wāhi tupuna, and wāhi tapu area</u> .The Plan must have regard to any relevant entry on the list (section 74(2)(b)(ii)(a) of the <del>Act</del> RMA).	Open Submission

# General Approach

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
General Approach	Rebecca Eng	99.10	Amend	General statement noting background information that provides context to submission points.	Amend or support as noted in each submission point and a outlined in full submission	Open Submission
General Approach /General /General	Sera Chambers	150.84	Oppose	considers that the current and proposed noise overlay for the Airport does not provide for the full extent of noise disturbance from this infrastructure outside of the Inner and Outer Airport Control Boundary Overlays. It also does not take into consideration health and safety and environmental impacts from increased flights over residential areas e.g. dust.	opposes on the basis that the plan should continue to allow the people of Napier the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated and compensated by the entity affecting e.g. noise from Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd.	Open Submission
General Approach /Classes of activities /Rules are the methods by which the Council achieves its objectives and policies. Activities are either provided as a permitted activity or are managed in the District Plan through the resource consent process.	Sera Chambers	150.87	Oppose	opposes on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue to enjoy their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development may impact on their property and any options to have the impact mitigated and compensated.	seeks that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue to enjoy their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how development may impact on their property and any options to have the impact mitigated and compensated.	Open Submission
General Approach /Activities with multiple activity status under the rules (bundling)	Sera Chambers	150.88	Oppose	opposes on the basis that the intention to bundle items is not appropriate as this could result in affected landowners not being made aware of a potential large change based on a proposal. the plan should continue to allow the people of Napier the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development may impact their property and any options have the impact mitigated and compensated.	seeks that items not be bundled.	Open Submission
General Approach /Objectives and policies in the District Plan	Sera Chambers	150.89	Oppose	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	Open Submission
General Approach /Notification /The rules in the District Plan may specify activities for which consent applications must be notified or specify that giving public notification of an application for resource consent is precluded or where giving limited notification of an application for resource consent is precluded.	Sera Chambers	150.90	Oppose	opposes on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue to enjoy their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development may impact on their property and any options to have the impact mitigated and compensated.	seeks that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue to enjoy their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development may impact on their property and any options to have the impact mitigated and compensated.	Open Submission
General Approach /Zoning of roads, railways, and rivers /All public roads (including state highways), railways, and rivers are zoned the same as the zoning of adjoining sites. Where a different zone applies on either side of the road, railway, or river, then the zoning will apply to the centreline of the road, railway, or river.	Tom Anderson	151.1	Support	Supports this approach, and notes that the zoning of roads is shown on the planning maps	Retain the zoning of roads as shown on the notified planning maps	Open Submission
General Approach /Permitted baseline	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.1	Amend	If the Plan provides for an activity as a permitted activity, then those effects are anticipated and should be included in the permitted baseline test.	Amend as follows: The permitted baseline test will not be applied where: <del>a. the application of the baseline would be inconsistent with Part 2 of the RMA;</del> b. the permitted activity baseline has uncertainties, is fanciful, or not credible, and <del>e. the application of the baseline would be inconsistent with objectives and policies in the District Plan.</del>	Open Submission

# General Approach

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
General Approach /Zoning of roads, railways, and rivers /All public roads (including state highways), railways, and rivers are zoned the same as the zoning of adjoining sites. Where a different zone applies on either side of the road, railway, or river, then the zoning will apply to the centreline of the road, railway, or river.	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.2	Support	As the majority of Powerco assets are located within roads, it supports the clarification of zoning that will apply to roads.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
General Approach /Structure of the District Plan	Angela Jones	240.1	Amend	Notes that the 'Information requirements' section of the Operative District Plan has been removed. Specific sections identifying information requirements in the Earthworks and Transport chapters are proposed. Supports the inclusion of information requirements as proposed but considers there is a need for similar information requirements for the Subdivision and Residential Zone chapters. Considers that there is a need to include advice for applicants to consider when applying for resource consent, particularly about needing to consider the need to consult with, and consider the needs of, Utilities companies.	Include an Information Requirements section in each chapter of the PDP, identifying that consultation with Utilities companies should be done prior to lodging a resource consent application under the rules in Subdivision or Residential Zone chapters.	Open Submission
General Approach /Structure of the District Plan	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.8	Amend	The explanation of this section states that "The objectives and policies in the District Plan are to be read and achieved in a manner consistent with the strategic objectives." Forest & Bird considers this wording inappropriate for the reasons set out below (refer to full submission):  ??? refer to table	Amend as follows: <u>"The strategic objectives help to implement relevant Council strategies and policies as well as statutory planning documents that the District Plan must give effect to. The strategic objectives may provide guidance on what the objectives and policies in other chapters of the District Plan are seeking to achieve, but these are to be considered together, and no fixed hierarchy exists between them."</u>	Open Submission
	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.9	Amend	Ensure that reference is made to the ECO chapter in all relevant chapters under the heading of 'Other related chapters include'. Some of the chapters include this heading (e.g. NFL), while others do not (e.g. the Energy, Infrastructure and Transport chapters).	Seeks to refer to the ECO chapter in all relevant chapters under the heading of 'Other related chapters include'. Seeks to consistently refer in each chapter to the other relevant chapters that a plan user should also check. The approach set out under the heading 'Other relevant District Plan provisions' in the CE chapter is a good template that should be used throughout.	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /General	Tony Michelle	73.1	Amend	Considers that a new definition should be included to recognise agricultural aviation's vital importance to primary production activities.	Amend the Definitions section by including the following: <u>Agricultural aviation activity means the intermittent operation of an aircraft from a rural airstrip or helicopter landing area for primary production, frost mitigation, biosecurity, or biodiversity purposes including stock management, and the application of fertiliser, agrichemicals, or vertebrate toxic agents (VTA's). For clarity, aircraft includes fixed-wing aeroplanes, helicopters, and unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV's)</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Tony Michelle	73.2	Amend	The submitter seeks to define a helicopter landing area for agricultural helicopter operations.	Amend the Definitions Section by including the following: <u>Helicopter landing area means any area of land, building, or structure intended or designed to be used, whether wholly or partly, for helicopter movement or servicing.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /PRIMARY PRODUCTION	Tony Michelle	73.3	Support	Considers that the definition of Primary Production should be retained as per the National Planning Standards.	Retain the definition of Primary Production in the Definitions Section as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Tony Michelle	73.4	Amend	The submitter considers that a new definition for Rural Airstrip should be added for agricultural aviation activities.	Amend the Definitions Section by including the following: <u>Rural airstrip means any defined area of land intended or designed to be used, whether wholly or partly, for the landing, departure, movement, or servicing of aircraft in the rural area.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /EARTHWORKS	Rebecca Eng	99.2	Support	Support definition as it is consistent with the National Planning Standard.	Retain the definiton.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /ELECTRICITY TRANSMISSION	Rebecca Eng	99.3	Support	Definition supported on the basis it will assist with plan interpretation in providing clarity as to the assets forming part of the National Grid.	Retain the definition	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /FUNCTIONAL NEED	Rebecca Eng	99.4	Support	Support definition as it reflect the National Planning Standard.	Retain the definiton	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /OPERATIONAL NEED	Rebecca Eng	99.5	Support	Definition is supported as it reflects the National Planning Standard.	Retain the definiton	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /INFRASTRUCTURE	Rebecca Eng	99.6	Support	The definiton reflects that provided in the RMA and is therefore supported.	Retain the definition	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /LAND DISTURBANCE	Rebecca Eng	99.7	Support	The definition reflects that provided in the National Planning Standards and is therefore supported.	Retain the definition.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /NATIONAL GRID	Rebecca Eng	99.8	Support	The definition is supported on the basis it will assist with plan interpretation in providing clarity as to the assets forming part of the National Grid.	Retain the definition	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /NATIONAL GRID SUBDIVISION CORRIDOR	Rebecca Eng	99.9	Amend	An amendment is sought to reflect the need to allow for cable swing during high winds, and to reflect the existing transmission assets within the district (being 110kv and 220kv lines both on towers). There are no poles or pi-poles in the city (noting the extent of actual assets within Napier is very limited). Amendment is sought to clarify how to measure the setbacks.	Amend the definition as follows: <b>NATIONAL GRID SUBDIVISION CORRIDOR</b> the area measured either side of the centreline of above ground National Grid line (identified on the planning maps as "Napier Transmission Lines") as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ 14m for 110kV national grid lines on single poles</li> <li>● 32m for 110kV transmission lines on towers</li> <li>* 37m for 220kV transmission lines</li> </ul>	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /NATIONAL GRID YARD	Rebecca Eng	99.11	Amend	Transpower seeks amendment to the definition to reflect there are no poles in the district, amendment to make it clear but clauses a) and b) apply, and amendment to remove repetitive wording within the clauses.	Amend the definition and image as follows: NATIONAL GRID YARD means the area located within: a. 12 metres in any direction from the outer visible edge of a "National Grid" support structure foundation; and or <del>b. the area located within 10m either side of the centreline of an overhead 110kV National Grid line on single poles; and or</del> b. c. the area located within 12 metres either side of the centreline of any overhead "National Grid" transmission line on towers (including tubular steel towers where these replace steel lattice towers). The National Grid Yard does not apply to underground cables or any transmission lines (or sections of line) that are designated. The measurement of setback distances from National Grid lines shall be taken from the centre line of the transmission line and the outer edge of any support structure. The centre line at any point is a straight line between the centre points of the two support structures at each end.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /NETWORK UTILITY OPERATOR	Rebecca Eng	99.12	Support	The definition reflects that provided in the RMA and is therefore supported.	Retain the definition.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /OPERATIONAL NEED	Rebecca Eng	99.13	Support	The definition reflects that provided in the National Planning Standards and is therefore supported.	Retain the definition.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /REVERSE SENSITIVITY	Rebecca Eng	99.14	Support	Support the definition. The concept recognises the relationship between existing activities and incompatible new or altered activities.	Retain the definition	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Rebecca Eng	99.15	Support	Support the definition, recognising that the definition applies in relation to a range of activities in the rural environment (not just the National Grid).	Retain the definition	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREA	Rebecca Eng	99.16	Support	Support definition.	Retain the definition	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS ACTIVITY	Andrea Millar	105.1	Support	Supports the definition of "community corrections activity", considers it consistent with the National Planning Standards and considers Community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending.	Retain the definition of "community corrections activity".	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Andrea Millar	105.2	Oppose	Considers there is no definition for households related to "residential units" Considers this is needed to clarify that a household is not necessarily limited to a family unit or a flatting arrangement (more commonly perceived household situations)	Insert a definition of "household" as follows: <b>HOUSEHOLD</b> means a person or group of people who live together as a unit whether or not: a. any or all of them are members of the same family; or b. one or more members of the group receives care, support and/or supervision (whether or not that care, support and/or supervision is provided by someone paid to do so).	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY	Andrea Millar	105.3	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of residential care facility considering the definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama. The proposed definition of "residential care facility" would not otherwise apply to the residential activities Ara Poutama provides. Including a reference to "charitable institutions" within the definition of "residential care facility" creates uncertainty as to whether residential accommodation provided by a charity is actually something other than a "residential activity".	Amend the definition of "residential care facility" as follows: RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY means the use of land and/or buildings such as an old persons' home, convalescent home, nursing home, rest home, women's or men's refuge, hospital, or hostel, or charitable institution in which board and lodging or lodging alone is provided or intended to be provided. This does not include a day care centre, travellers' accommodation, or a retirement complex.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY	Andrea Millar	105.4	Support	Supports definition of "residential activity" and considerst it with the National Planning Standards. Considers the definition to provide for reintegration and rehabilitation support and social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety.	Retain the definition of "residential activity".	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /RESIDENTIAL UNIT	Andrea Millar	105.5	Support	Supports definition of "residential unit" and considerst it with the National Planning Standards. Considers the definition to provide for reintegration and rehabilitation support and social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety.	Retain the definition of "residential unit".	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /General	Jimmy Guerin	134.1	Amend	The submitter considers that agricultural aviation is vitally important in protecting and maintaining primary production and as such it should be recognised and provided for in the PDP.	Amend Definitions Section by inserting the following: <u>Agricultural aviation activity means the intermittent operation of an aircraft from a rural airstrip or helicopter landing area for primary production, frost mitigation, biosecurity, or biodiversity purposes including stock management, and the application of fertiliser, agrichemicals, or vertebrate toxic agents (VTA's). For clarity, aircraft includes fixed-wing aeroplanes, helicopters, and unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV's)</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Jimmy Guerin	134.2	Amend	The submitter seeks to define a helicopter landing area for agricultural helicopter operations.	Amend the Definitions Section by including the following: <u>Helicopter landing area means any area of land, building, or structure intended or designed to be used, whether wholly or partly, for helicopter movement or servicing</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /PRIMARY PRODUCTION	Jimmy Guerin	134.3	Support	The submitter considers the Definition of Primary Production as per the National Planning Standards is appropriate	Retain the Definition of Primary Production in the Definitions Section as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Jimmy Guerin	134.4	Amend	The submitter considers that a new Definition for Rural Airstrip should be added for agricultural aviation activities.	Amend the Definitions Section by including the following: <u>Rural airstrip means any defined area of land intended or designed to be used, whether wholly or partly, for the landing, departure, movement, or servicing of aircraft in the rural area.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /ALTERATION OR ADDITION	Sera Chambers	150.110	Amend	considers that it is not clear from the section how people are made aware that 30% of their land could be removed if classified heritage.	seeks to amend to include how people will be made aware that 30% of their land could be removed if classified heritage.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /ANTENNA	Tom Anderson	151.2	Amend	Support having a definition, but the origin of the definition should be included, being the National Environmental Standard for Telecommunication Facilities 2016	Amend the definition to <u>has the same meaning as Section 4 of the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities) Regulations 2016 being: means a device that receives or transmits radiocommunication or telecommunication signals, but not a small cell unit</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /CABINET	Tom Anderson	151.3	Amend	Seeks amendment as per the definition for Antenna, include the NESTF as the origin for the definition.	Amend to use same introductory wording as per the Antenna definition	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /FUNCTIONAL NEED	Tom Anderson	151.4	Support	Supports the definition of functional need	Retain the definition of functional need	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /INFRASTRUCTURE	Tom Anderson	151.5	Support	Supports the definition of infrastructure.	Retain the definition of infrastructure	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /MAINTENANCE (NETWORK UTILITIES)	Tom Anderson	151.6	Support	Supports definition of maintenance for network utilities	Retain the definition of maintenance (network utilities) as notified	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /MINOR UPGRADING OF NETWORK UTILITIES	Tom Anderson	151.7	Oppose	Opposes as there is no need for the definition, as the parameters as to what constitutes minor upgrading are effectively defined in INF-R2	Delete the definition	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /NETWORK UTILITY	Tom Anderson	151.8	Support	Supports definition of network utility	Retain the definition of network utility as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /NETWORK UTILITY OPERATOR	Tom Anderson	151.9	Support	Supports definition of network utility operator	Retain the definition of network utility operator as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /REVERSE SENSITIVITY	Tom Anderson	151.1	Amend	Supports the definition of reverse sensitivity, however it is unclear what the term "vulnerable" means in the definition as notified	Amend the definition as follows means the <del>vulnerable potential for the operation of an existing lawfully established activity to be compromised, constrained, or curtailed by the more recent establishment or alteration of another activity which may be sensitive to the actual, potential, or perceived adverse environmental effects generated by the existing activity or structure.</del>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /TEMPORARY INFRASTRUCTURE	Tom Anderson	151.11	Support	Supports definition of temporary infrastructure	Retain the definition of temporary infrastructure as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /UPGRADING (NETWORK UTILITIES)	Tom Anderson	151.12	Amend	Supports a definition of upgrading and it is noted the definition differentiates from 'maintenance' which is also a defined term in the PDP. Considers that 'Minor Upgrading of Network Utilities' is also defined in the PDP, and the definition of upgrading should also differentiate from that term.	Amend the definition as follows:as it applies to network utilities, means the replacement, repair or renewal or improvement or increase in carrying capacity, operational efficiency, security or safety of existing network utilities but excludes 'maintenance' and 'minor upgrading of network utilities'.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /INFRASTRUCTURE	Tom Anderson	151.16	Support	Supports definition of infrastructure	Retain the definition of infrastructure	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /	Tom Anderson	151.19	Amend	Considers that a definition of 'Significant Infrastructure' is needed, as this is a term which is defined elsewhere in the PDP. Notes that the Hawke's Bay RPS has a definition of 'Strategic Infrastructure' which is out of date, but includes reference to 'strategic telecommunications networks'. The PDP definition of significant infrastructure should be based on the RPS definition of strategic infrastructure, but include reference to 'telecommunication networks' not 'strategic telecommunications networks'	Add a definition of Significant Infrastructure and ensure that it includes reference to telecommunication networks	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /OPERATIONAL NEED	Tom Anderson	151.70	Support	Supports as the definition is as per the National Planning Standards, and is appropriate	Retain the definition as notified	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /OPERATIONAL NEED	Tom Anderson	151.72	Support	Supports the definition of Operational Need	Retain the definition	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /ROAD	Tom Anderson	151.73	Support	The definition of Road	Retain the definition of Road	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /ROOT PROTECTION AREA	Tom Anderson	151.77	Support	Supports as the definition is clear and appropriate.	Retain the definition as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /SIGN	Tom Anderson	151.78	Amend	Supports The definition , although explicit recognition of signs associated with infrastructure should be included.	Amend the definition as follows: SIGN means any device, character, graphic or electronic display, whether temporary or permanent; which a. is for the purposes of— i. identification of or provision of information about any activity, property or structure or an aspect of public safety; ii. providing directions; or iii. promoting goods, services or events; iv. <u>provision of information concerning infrastructure</u> ; and b. is projected onto, or fixed or attached to, any, structure or natural object; and c. includes the frame, supporting device and any ancillary equipment whose function is to support the message or notice	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	James Witham	165.3	Support	Gives effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land	Retain definition as notified	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	James Witham	165.4	Support	Supports definition as it appropriately identifies activities which require high levels of amenity.	Retain definition as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /SPECIAL AUDIBLE CHARACTERISTIC	James Witham	165.5	Support	Supports the provision as appropriate and necessary to consider certain noise measurement.	Retain definition as notified	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /VERSATILE LAND	James Witham	165.6	Support	Supports the inclusion of this definition as appropriate and gives effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Retain definition as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	James Witham	165.7	Amend	Considers nationally district plans are moving towards the use of the term 'frost fans'. Seeks amendment to expand on the definition of 'crop protection devices' and ensure national consistency.	Include the following definition as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission: <u>Frost fan</u> <u>Frost fan means a land based device designed or adapted to mitigate frost damage by fanning warmer air over potentially frost affected surfaces and includes:</u> a. <u>Fan blades;</u> b. <u>Motive source;</u> c. <u>Support structure/tower</u> d. <u>Plinth</u> e. <u>Associated probes and communications and networking devices</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	James Witham	165.8	Amend	Considers the term 'non-rural' is unclear in what it applies to as a number of activities are provided for in rural areas as permitted activities, potentially including residential dwellings. Seeks clarity that this is not what is intended as a 'rural activity' for interpretation	Include the following definition as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission: <u>Non-rural activities</u> <u>any activity that is not a primary production activity, or ancillary or accessory to primary production located in a rural zone</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	James Witham	165.9	Amend	Considers the definition of 'reverse sensitivity' is narrow and only applies in circumstances where activities are established and more sensitive activities establish later. Notes that the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land directs priority to be given to land based primary production on Highly Productive Land, regardless of when it is established. Notes that the Objectives and Policies of the Proposed District Plan supports primary production on Versatile Soils and the Rural Production Zone generally. Considers that where sensitive activities are established and there is a change from one land based primary production activity to another, the term 'reverse sensitivity' does not apply, but the effects of land based primary production should be prioritised and sensitivity issues managed.	Include the following definition as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission: <u>Sensitivity effects</u> <u>means the vulnerable potential for the operation of a not yet established activity, but prioritised in its location above other activities sensitive to its actual or potential effects, to be compromised, constrained, or curtailed by the presence or establishment or alteration of another activity which may be sensitive to the actual, potential or perceived adverse effects generated by the prioritised activity.</u>	Open Submission



# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /ACTIVITIES SENSITIVE TO NOISE	Sheena McGuire	168.2	Oppose	Considers that this definition is duplication of 'Noise Sensitive Activity'. Seeks deletion of this definition and reliance on one definition for clear and consistent interpretation and application of the plan.	Delete definition	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /FUNCTIONAL NEED	Sheena McGuire	168.3	Support	Supports definition as proposed.	Retain as proposed	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Sheena McGuire	168.4	Amend	Seeks the inclusion of a definition of High Land Transport Noise Control Overlay for clarity. This submission point aligns with other submitters other submission points on the Noise Chapter and Planning Maps seeking the inclusion of provisions and amendment to the High Land Transport Noise mapped overlay extent.	Add new definition as follows: <b>High Land Transport Noise Control Overlay</b> <u>means the area potentially affected by noise between a railway corridor boundary or State Highway boundary and a distance of 100m. High Land Transport Noise Control Overlay shown on the planning maps identifies areas that have the potential to experience high noise levels from rail and road traffic. New buildings and alterations to habitable rooms in buildings used for sensitive land uses are required to demonstrate that adverse noise effects have been appropriately managed by demonstrating compliance with the standards specified in the Noise Chapter.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /INFRASTRUCTURE	Sheena McGuire	168.5	Support	Supports as the definition as proposed which as the same meaning as the RMA definition, is supported by KiwiRail, noting clause (g) includes rail.	Retain as proposed	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /MAINTENANCE (NETWORK UTILITIES)	Sheena McGuire	168.6	Support	Supports maintenance definition that includes replacement, repair or renewal works necessary to continue the operation and/or functioning of an existing network utility.	Retain as proposed	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /MINOR UPGRADING OF NETWORK UTILITIES	Sheena McGuire	168.7	Support	Supports minor upgrading of network utilities including increasing efficiency and capacity of network utilities if similar in scale and character.	Retain as proposed	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /NETWORK UTILITY	Sheena McGuire	168.8	Support	Supports reference to Network Utility Operator which includes KiwiRail.	Retain as proposed	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /NETWORK UTILITY OPERATOR	Sheena McGuire	168.9	Support	Supports the use of the RMA meaning of Network Utility Operator, which includes a person who constructs and operates a railway line. This approach supports the integrated management and provision of key infrastructure.	Retain as proposed	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /NOISE SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Sheena McGuire	168.10	Amend	Seeks amendment to the definition of Noise Sensitive Activity to specify a consistent list of noise sensitive activities to assist with the clear interpretation of the proposed plan. The recommended relief considers the proposed definitions for 'Activities Sensitive to Noise' and 'Noise Sensitive Activity' and seeks to provide a clear definition that captures activities as intended.	Amend as follows: <del>Any use of land and/or buildings which is likely to be susceptible to the effects of noise emitted from nearby land uses in the course of their legitimate operation and functioning, and for the purposes of this plan</del> <u>means any lawfully established:</u> <u>(a) Residential activity including activity in visitor accommodation, retirement accommodation, boarding houses, office accommodation and papakainga;</u> <u>(b) Educational activity;</u> <u>(c) Health care activity, including hospitals;</u> <u>(d) Congregation within any place of worship; and</u> <u>(e) Activity at a marae.</u> <del>includes day care centres, education facilities (but not any trade training or other industry related educational facility), health care centres, hospitality activities, office accommodation, places of assembly, residential activities, retirement complexes, travellers' accommodation, and camping grounds.</del>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /NOISE SENSITIVE SPACE	Sheena McGuire	168.11	Support	Supports definition as proposed, subject to 'Noise Sensitive Activity' definition amendments.	Retain as proposed	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /OPERATIONAL NEED	Sheena McGuire	168.12	Support	Supports definition as proposed.	Retain as proposed	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /PORT NOISE	Sheena McGuire	168.13	Support	Notes that Napier Port Branch is used to transport freight to and from Napier Port. Supports inclusion of rail activities related to port activities within this definition.	Retain as proposed	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /PORT RELATED ACTIVITIES	Sheena McGuire	168.14	Support	Supports the inclusion of rail activities within this definition. Submitter operates the Napier Port Branch and it is important to include rail activities within this definition to accurately capture all port activities within Napier City.	Retain as proposed	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Sheena McGuire	168.15	Amend	Seeks the inclusion of a new definition of Rail Vibration Alert Area Overlay for clarity. This submission point aligns with other submission points on the Noise Chapter and Planning Maps seeking the inclusion of new introductory text and a mapped overlay.	Add new definition as follows: <b>Rail Vibration Alert Area Overlay</b> <u>means the area potentially affected by vibration between a railway corridor boundary and a distance of 60m.</u>	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /General	Sheena McGuire	168.16	Amend	Regionally Significant Infrastructure is a term that is used in the Plan. Seeks inclusion of a definition of this term, including rail, for clear interpretation of the Plan.	Add new definiton of Regionally Significant Infrastructure which includes the rail network.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /REVERSE SENSITIVITY	Sheena McGuire	168.17	Amend	Supports the definition of reverse sensitivity subject to amendment. Seeks amendment to recognise that in the context of rail, activities are more than operation of the railway and the definition also needs to encompass ongoing maintenance of the rail network including rail yards. It is appropriate to recognise the vulnerability of existing, lawfully established activities such as the rail network to other activities in the vicinity which may be sensitive to adverse environmental effects.	Amend as follows: means the vulnerable potential for the <u>development, upgrading, operation and maintenance</u> of an existing lawfully established activity to be compromised, constrained, or curtailed by the more recent establishment or alteration of another activity which may be sensitive to the actual, potential, or perceived adverse environmental effects generated by the existing activity or structure.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Sheena McGuire	168.18	Amend	Seeks clarification on whether this definition includes retirement accommodation.	Amend for consistency with 'Noise Sensitive Activity' list.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Sheena McGuire	168.19	Amend	Seeks the inclusion of a definition of Transport Network. Transport network is a term is used throughout the Plan and for clarity, KiwiRail seeks a definition which includes the rail network.	Add new definiton of Transport Network which includes the rail network.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /UPGRADING (NETWORK UTILITIES)	Sheena McGuire	168.20	Support	Supports the specific ability to improve or increase the safety or efficiency of existing infrastructure as defined as upgrading.	Retain as proposed	Open Submission
Definitions / /	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.15	Amend	There is currently no definiton of passive recreation or informal recreation in the proposed District Plan. This would be useful to link to rules for these less organized/active recreation activities in zones such as the Te Whanganui-a- Orotū (Ahuriri Estuary) Stormwater and Ecology Special Zone (AESZ).	Introduce definition of "passive recreation" consistent with or similar to the following: Means any recreation activity where the principal aim is the enjoyment of <u>leisure of a primarily non competitive casual nature that does not involve the use of vehicles (excluding bicycles) and motorised equipment and also excludes any organised sport and freedom camping (responsible camping). It includes amenity and conservation plantings, habitat restoration and enhancement, children's playgrounds, seating and tables, barbeque facilities, pedestrian walkways, cycleways, jogging tracks, viewing platforms and lookouts, the erection and use of information boards, directional signage, fencing, public artwork/sculptures, public toilets and other buildings and structures necessary for the maintenance and operational needs of the recreation area and associated carparking.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /DEVELOPMENT	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfie	172.3	Amend	Powerco is concerned that the definiton would inappropriately capture infrastructure. The term is utilised to broadly characterise development in the Strategic Direction and Financial Contributions chapters, however it should not apply to infrastructure. Clearly it would be inappropriate to apply such a consideration to gas networks. It is noted that the term 'infrastructure' is individually referenced throughout these chapters.	Amend as follows: DEVELOPMENT means the erection or placement of buildings and structures, and/or the resurfacing of land, <u>but excludes infrastructure.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /EARTHWORKS	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfie	172.4	Support	Powerco supports this natonal planning standards definiton.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /FUNCTIONAL NEED	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfie	172.5	Support	Powerco supports this natonal planning standards definiton.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /INFRASTRUCTURE	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfie	172.6	Support	Powerco supports this definiton as contained in s2 of the RMA.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /MAINTENANCE (NETWORK UTILITIES)	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfie	172.7	Amend	Powerco generally supports this definiton however specific reference to pipelines needs to be included.	Amend as follows: MAINTENANCE (NETWORK UTILITIES) any replacement, repair or renewal work or activity necessary to continue the operation and/or functioning of an existing network utility. Includes the replacement of an existing line, <u>pipeline</u> , building, structure or other facilities with another of the same or similar height, size and scale, within the same or similar position and for the same or similar purpose. Also includes the addition of extra lines to existing or replacement poles or other support structures.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /MINOR UPGRADING OF NETWORK UTILITIES	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfie	172.8	Amend	Powerco supports the need for this definiton, however it needs to be clear that replacement structures or networks are anticipated under this definition. Upgrading works often entail replacement components.	Amend as follows: MINOR UPGRADING OF NETWORK UTILITIES means an increase in the capacity, efficiency, or security of existing infrastructure where this utilises existing structures and networks and/or <u>replacement</u> structures and networks of a similar scale and character.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /NETWORK UTILITY	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfie	172.9	Support	Powerco supports this definiton and the clarity which it provides.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /NETWORK UTILITY OPERATOR	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfie	172.1	Support	Powerco supports this natonal planning standards definiton.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /OPERATIONAL NEED	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfie	172.11	Support	Powerco supports this national planning standards definiton.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /TEMPORARY INFRASTRUCTURE	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfie	172.12	Support	Powerco supports this definiton and the clarity which it provides.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /UPGRADING (NETWORK UTILITIES)	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfie	172.13	Amend	Powerco supports the need for this definiton, however as there is also a definition of 'minor upgrading' in the Plan this also needs to be excluded from this definition for clarity.	Amend as follows: UPGRADING (NETWORK UTILITIES) s it applies to network utilities, means the replacement, repair or renewal or improvement or increase in carrying capacity, operational efficiency, security or safety of existing network utilities but excludes 'maintenance' and 'minor upgrading'.	Open Submission
Definitions /General /General	Jeremy Harding	177.2	Support	Considers it appropriate to use the National Planning Standards definitions throughout as this provides consistency and avoids misinterpretation.	Retention of definitions where they are consistent with National Planning Standards definitions (inferred).	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /PRIMARY PRODUCTION	Jeremy Harding	177.3	Amend	Considers the definition of 'Primary Production' to be appropriate as it uses the National Planning Standards definition and incorporates quarrying as a primary industry, however references to primary production in the PDP exclude quarrying and support for primary production does not extend to quarrying.	Provide for quarrying activities in the PDP (inferred).	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Jeremy Harding	177.4	Amend	The definition of highly productive land in the PDP has been taken from the NPS:HPL rather than the National Planning Standards. The NPS:HPL places significant emphasis and value on the agricultural value of the soil and disregards the value and productiveness of land used for aggregate extraction. Like highly productive soils, aggregate extraction is location- specific. The original intent of the NPS:HPL was to protect highly productive land for future primary production. This would include quarrying recognising that other factors in addition to soil determine the productive capacity of land.	Seeks that Council revisit the provisions managing highly productive soils (inferred) after planned changes to the NPS-HPL have been made by the new Government.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /PORT RELATED ACTIVITIES	Mark Leggett	180.2	Oppose	Opposes and considers the definition of 'Port-related activity' needs clarification regarding entities beyond Napier Port authority. Notes the submitter's critical operations at the Port involving bulk cement unloading, storage, and loading and operational elements include freight handling, transitional storage, vehicle maneuvering, and ancillary distribution. Considers permitted activity status for 'Port-related activities' is appropriate but requires clarity. Seeks amendment to include activities by entities beyond Napier Port authority for clarity.	Amend definition for 'Port-related activities' to read (in part): 'The use of land and/or buildings by any entity not limited to the Port Napier Authority ...'	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /ALLOTMENT	Angela McFlynn	189.1	Amend	The submitter considers that the Definition of Allotment should be consistent with the NPS.	Replace and amend the Definitions Section Allotment as follows: allotment has the same meaning as in section 218 of the RMA (as set out in the box below) <u>(2) In this Act, the term allotment means—</u> <u>(a) any parcel of land under the Land Transfer Act 2017 that is a continuous area and whose boundaries are shown separately on a survey plan, whether or not—</u> <u>(i) the subdivision shown on the survey plan has been allowed, or</u> <u>subdivision approval has been granted, under another Act; or</u> <u>(ii) a subdivision consent for the subdivision shown on the survey plan has been granted under this Act; or</u> <u>(b) any parcel of land or building or part of a building that is shown or identified separately—</u> <u>(i) on a survey plan; or</u> <u>(ii) on a licence within the meaning of subpart 6 of Part 3 of the Land Transfer Act 2017; or</u> <u>(c) any unit on a unit plan; or</u> <u>(d) any parcel of land not subject to the Land Transfer Act 2017.</u> <u>(3) For the purposes of subsection (2), an allotment that is—</u> <u>(a) subject to the Land Transfer Act 2017 and is comprised in 1 record of title or for which 1 record of title could be issued under that Act; or</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /COMMUNAL OPEN SPACES	Angela McFlynn	189.2	Amend	The submitter considers that the Communal Open Spaces Definition suggests that this can only be provided when a development contains five or more residential units. There are no rules / standards / or assessment criteria within the Plan that would preclude a development of less than 5 units providing communal open space. The definition in the plan it is considered should reflect this.	COMMUNAL OPEN SPACES means, in relation to developments of <del>five two or more residential units or Papakāinga developments, a specified quantity of landscaped land freely available to all residents on the site, exclusive of driveways, buildings, and the private outdoor living space requirements of individual household units.</del>	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /NET SITE AREA	Angela McFlynn	189.3	Amend	The submitter considers that the Definition of Net Site Area should be the same as the NPS in the Plan.	Amend the Definitions Section Net Site Area to that in the NPS as follows: NET SITE AREA means the total area of the site, but excludes: a. any part of the site that provides legal access to another site; b. any part of a rear site that provides legal access to that site; <del>c. any part of the site used for access to the site;</del> d. any part of the site subject to a designation that may be taken or acquired under the Public Works Act 1981.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /AIRCRAFT OPERATION	Richard Milner	190.2	Amend	Aircraft operation is misleading to aircrafts used in an emergency. Change to any aircraft landing or taking off in an emergency. In Gabrielle once the declared emergency had been lifted there were still many homes without essentials and aircraft provided these. With other limitations this plan would have been restricted. Therefore, seeks to amend to include bold section. Flights required to meet the needs of a national or civil defence emergency declared under the Civil Defence Emergency Act 2002; <b>and subsequent flying operations required to aid persons and property after the declared emergency has been lifted as reasonably practicable.</b> Other essential operations such has but not limited to maintenance of assets for continuity of services should also be included such as those for Peer, Telecommunications, gas, water etc. Amend to include the bold section Aircraft undertaking firefighting, search and rescue and <b>maintenance of assets for continuity of service duties.</b>	Seeks to amend section A, D, F to include bold sections.Refer to submission for full details.	Open Submission
Definitions //	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.6	Amend	The current definiton of heavy industry is not clear enough for use in plan implementation. The matters to be managed will be controlled through standards and other rules in the plan.	Delete the definiton "heavy industry".	Open Submission
Definitions //	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.15	Amend	There is currently no definiton for "Fully Serviced Site". This could cause difficulty in implementation the density standard (SETZ-S1) and minimum lot size standard (SUB-S3) for the Settlement Zone.	Add new definition for "Fully Serviced Site" means a site connected to water supply, reticulated wastewater and stormwater systems that are provided by one or more network utility operators where those systems comply fully with the requirements of Chapter 66 (Volume II - Code of Practice for Subdivision and Land Development).	Open Submission
Definitions //	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.5	Amend	A definiton for "attachment" is required to accompany the new permitted activity rule sought for the HH and heritage overlay chapters.	Amend Definitions chapter to add new term: "Attachment: means, in relation to heritage items and heritage character overlays, part or all of any structure, pipe, equipment or cable that is externally fixed to the building or item to perform a particular function and includes, but is not limited to: • Customer connections, relating to radio communication or telecommunication lines; wastewater or stormwater treatment or disposal; and/or water, gas or electricity • Fire alarm panels • Sprinkler inlets • Air conditioning units • Heat pumps	Open Submission
Definitions //	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.72	Amend	The current definiton of "Residential care facility" refers to travellers' accommodation. This term is not defined in the proposed District Plan. Instead, the definition should refer to "visitor accommodation". This is an error.	Update definiton of "Residential care facility" to delete "travellers' accommodation" and replace with "visitor accommodation".	Open Submission
Definitions //	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.82	Amend	The current proposed definiton of Highly Productive Land only refers to land that is mapped in the Regional Policy Statement. This also needs to include the interim application of HPL to ensure the rule framework can apply in advance of HBRC doing the mapping, to give effect to the NPS:HPL.	Amend definition as follows (or similar relief) : has the same meaning as in National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022 (as below): means land that has been mapped in accordance with the NPSHPL and is included in an operative regional policy statement as required by the NPSHPL; or <u>prior to HPL being mapped in an operative regional policy statement, means land subject to clause 3.5(7) of the NPSHPL.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /ACTIVITIES SENSITIVE TO AIRCRAFT NOISE	Ellen Robotham	198.2	Amend	Considers the definition to be generally consistent with the expert acoustic advice provided by Marshall Day Acoustics and attached as Appendix 4 to this submission.HBAL considers however, that the definition should refer to "long term visitor accommodation", consistent with the advice from Marshall Day Acoustics.	Amend as follows: means any residential activity, <u>long term</u> visitor accommodation ....	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /AIRCRAFT OPERATION	Ellen Robotham	198.3	Amend	Considers the definition to be generally consistent with the expert acoustic advice provided by Marshall Day Acoustics and attached as Appendix 4 to this submission.HBAL considers, however, that the definition should also refer to heads of state and dignitaries as per the Notice of Requirement.	Amend as follows: <del>means includes ground movements, take offs and landings, but excludes:</del> a) Aircraft landing or taking off in an emergency; b) Emergency flights required to rescue persons from life threatening situations or to transport patients, human organs or medical personnel in medical emergency; c) Aircraft using the airport due to unforeseen circumstances as an essential alternative to landing at the planned destination airport; d) Flights required to meet the needs of a national or civil defence emergency declared under the Civil Defence Emergency Act 2002; e) Flights certified by the Minister of Defence as necessary for reasons of National security in accordance with section 4 of the Resource Management Act 1991,; f) <u>Aircraft carrying heads of state and/or senior dignitaries acting in their official capacity;</u> g) <u>other military aircraft operations; and</u> h) Aircraft undertaking firefighting or search and rescue duties.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /AIRPORT ACTIVITY	Ellen Robotham	198.4	Amend	Considers the definition appropriately includes a variety of activities which are directly related or ancillary to the function and operation of the Airport. The current wording limits the interpretation of Airport Activities to the list provided. The wording should be amended to enable additional activities essential to running an airport which may not have been considered at this time and to incorporate activities anticipated by the definition of 'Airport Related Activities' which is requested to be deleted.	Amend as follows: means the <del>following use of land and/or buildings related to or ancillary to the function and operation of the Hawke's Bay Airport, including:</del> ... j) retail activities <del>within terminal buildings;</del> ... l) activities and facilities <del>directly associated with servicing the needs of airport passengers, visitors, and employees;</del> ... r) stormwater facilities, <u>and</u> infrastructure, <u>and</u> utility activities;	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /AIRPORT RELATED ACTIVITIES	Ellen Robotham	198.5	Oppose	Consider this definition replicates the definition of "Airport Activity" and may cause confusion for the plan user. The definition should be deleted and incorporated into the definition of 'Airport Activity'.The use of aerodromes or airports has evolved well beyond the provision of traditional 'runways and terminals'. Modern airports now encompass a broad range of activities in order to provide for the needs and demands of aircraft passengers, crew, ground staff, airport workers and those that meet and greet travellers.  Airports now often provide for a range of industrial, commercial and logistical land uses, as such uses either provide direct servicing to the aviation industry, or feed directly off it. As noted above, those Airports with diversified income streams were found to recover more quickly from the sudden halt in air travel as a result of Covid-19. This requires flexibility to properly enable forward planning and development necessary to respond to changing demands that arise at a modern airport. Previous court cases support this (see full submission for more detail).  The PDP has separate definitions for Airport Activities and Airport Related Activities, which have a high-level overlap. The key distinction is whether or not the activity is undertaken by a "third party".Many operational functions of the Airport are provided by third parties eg. air traffic control, and are not directly undertaken by HBAL.  Furthermore, the effects of these activities are materially the same whether they are undertaken by HBAL or a "third party". The distinction created by these two definitions is therefore artificial and the definition of "Airport Related Activities" should therefore be deleted and consequential amendments made to the provisions of the Airport Zone.	Delete.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /CAFÉ	Ellen Robotham	198.6	Oppose	Café is a commonly understood term and this definition does not appear to provide any unique understanding within the context of the PDP. It is therefore unnecessary.	Delete.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /NETWORK UTILITY	Ellen Robotham	198.7	Support	The definiton appropriately relates to network utlity operator.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /NETWORK UTILITY OPERATOR	Ellen Robotham	198.8	Support	Supports the definition as it aligns with the National Planning Standards.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /NOISE SENSITIVE SPACE	Ellen Robotham	198.9	Amend	It is appropriate to include a definition of noise sensitive spaces which identify those parts of buildings that require acoustic treatment in order to manage noise effects. The definition requires expanding however, to ensure it captures noise sensitive spaces where they relate to an activity sensitive to aircraft noise.	Amend as follows: Any indoor space within a Noise Sensitive Activity <u>or Activity Sensitive to Aircraft Noise that is regularly used for high quality listening or communication, for example, principle living areas and classrooms, or rooms used for sleeping (such as bedrooms). It excludes excluding any bathroom, water closet, laundry, pantry, walk in wardrobe, corridor, hallway, lobby, stairwell, clothes drying area, kitchens not part of a dwelling, garage or other space of a specialised nature occupied neither frequently nor for extended periods.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /REVERSE SENSITIVITY	Ellen Robotham	198.1	Amend	Considers the definition reflects the commonly referred to principle to “reverse sensitivity” however amendments are requested to improve consistency with the Wellington City Council Proposed District Plan.	Amend as follows: means the <del>vulnerable potential for the operation of an existing lawfully established activity to be compromised, constrained, or curtailed by the more recent establishment or alteration of another activity which may be sensitive to the actual, potential, or perceived adverse environmental effects generated by the existing activity or structure.</del>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Ellen Robotham	198.11	Amend	Considers new definitions should be included in the Proposed Plan to ensure clear and consistent plan interpretation with respect to the management of activities sensitive to aircraft noise.	Insert the following new definitions: <u>Aircraft Noise Overlay: means a boundary shown on the District Plan maps, the location of which is based on predicted day/night sound levels of Ldn 55dB from future aircraft operations at Hawke’s Bay Airport.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Ellen Robotham	198.12		Considers new definitions should be included in the Proposed Plan to ensure clear and consistent plan interpretation of the terms significant infrastructure and regionally significant infrastructure, both of which are used throughout the Proposed Plan.	Regionally Significant Infrastructure: has the same meaning as ‘Strategic Infrastructure’ in the Hawke’s Bay Regional Resource Management Plan (as below): <b>Strategic Infrastructure</b> <u>Those necessary facilities, services and installations which are of greater than local significance, and can include infrastructure that is nationally significant. The following are examples of strategic infrastructure</u> :a) <u>strategic transport networks</u> b) <u>Hawke’s Bay Regional Airport</u> c) <u>Port of Napier</u> d) <u>Omarunui Regional Landfill</u> e) <u>strategic telecommunications and radiocommunications facilities</u> f) <u>the electricity transmission network and electricity distribution networks</u> g) <u>renewable electricity generation activities</u> h) <u>pipelines and gas facilities used for the transmission and distribution of natural and manufactured gas</u> i) <u>public or community sewage treatment plants and associated reticulation and disposal systems;</u> j) <u>public water supply intakes, treatment plants and distribution systems</u> k) <u>public or community rural water storage infrastructure, including distribution systems</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Hus Narsai	205.1	Amend	Opposes the lack of specific recognition for “trade suppliers” throughout the PDP. No definition is provided for this activity and it is broadly provided for under the “retail activity” only. Considers it critical that definitions appropriately provides for the establishment of future activities.	Include definition of trade suppliers within the definitions chapter with wording such as: “Trade suppliers Means a business engaging in sales to business and institutional customers (but may also include sales to the general public) whose products wholly consist of one or more of the following categories:Automotive or marine supplies; Building supplies; Catering equipment; Farming and agricultural supplies; Garden and outdoor equipment; Industrial supplies; Landscape supplies; Outdoor recreation equipment; Pet supplies; and Maintenance and cleaning supplies.”	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /NET SITE AREA	Guy Panckhurst	210.9	Amend	It is not clear what is meant by "part of the site used for access". This description is not precise enough for clear interpretation.	Seeks to clearly define "part of the site used for access".	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY	Holly Jenkins	214.12	Amend	Seeks the specific inclusion of Retail Activity within the definition of Commercial Activity as the Commercial Zone rules and standards only permit Commercial Activities for clarity.	Amend the definition as follows: COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY means any activity trading in goods, equipment or services. It includes any ancillary activity to the commercial activity (for example administrative or head offices). <u>It includes all retail activities.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /RETAIL ACTIVITY	Holly Jenkins	214.13	Amend	Considers proposed definitions for for Commercial Activity or Retail Activity are unclear in addressing supermarkets. Considers that supermarket related activities are appropriately captured by "retail activity" and seek the specific inclusion of supermarkets within the proposed definition of Retail Activity.	Amend the definition as follows: RETAIL ACTIVITY means land and/or buildings from which goods, merchandise, equipment or services are sold, exposed, displayed or offered for sale or direct hire to the public and includes <u>supermarkets, markets, showrooms, and liquor outlets not part of a hospitality activity, and associated activities.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /ANCILLARY ACTIVITY	Georgina McPherson	215.2	Support	Support the identified definitions being the same as set out in Section 2 of the Resource Management Act and/or aligning with the definition standards under the National Planning Standards.	Retain as notified the definitions in the Proposed Plan which are aligned with Section 2 of the Resource Management Act and the National Planning Standards, including the definitions for: Ancillary activity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building</li> <li>• Commercial activity</li> <li>• Contaminant</li> <li>• Contaminated land</li> <li>• Discharge</li> <li>• Drain</li> <li>• Earthworks</li> <li>• Functional need</li> <li>• Ground level</li> <li>• Hazardous Substance</li> <li>• Industrial Activity</li> <li>• Infrastructure</li> <li>• Land Disturbance</li> <li>• Natural Hazard</li> <li>• Network Utility</li> <li>• Network Utility Operator</li> <li>• Noise</li> <li>• Notonal Boundary</li> <li>• Official sign</li> <li>• Operatonal Need</li> <li>• Sign</li> <li>• Structure</li> </ul>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /AIRPORT ACTIVITY	Georgina McPherson	215.3	Support	Facilities for handling and storage of hazardous substances, fuel installations and fuel servicing facilities are essential to the functioning and operation of Hawke's Bay Airport. Specifically providing for these activities in the definition of an airport activity is supported by the Fuel Companies.	Retain definition as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /ALTERATION OR ADDITION	Georgina McPherson	215.4	Oppose	Is not necessarily concerned about the definition of the term when related to heritage, however the term is used throughout the Plan in circumstances outside of this context. In these situations, the definition is inappropriate.	Rename the defined term as follows: Alteration and Addition ( <u>Heritage</u> ) And Remove the hyperlinks to this definition from all rules, standards and other provisions, unless the rule, standard or provision is specifically referring to an identified heritage building or structure.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /BORE	Georgina McPherson	215.5	Oppose	The term 'bore' is defined in the Proposed Plan. However, this term does not appear to be used in any other parts of the Proposed Plan, such that it is unclear why it is needed. It is also noted that the definition of 'bore' in the Proposed Plan varies from that contained in the Hawke's Bay Regional Resource Management Plan (RRMP). For these reasons, the Fuel Companies consider the definition should be deleted.	Delete the definition of bore.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /DEVELOPMENT	Georgina McPherson	215.6	Amend	Support the definition of 'development' to the extent it applies to the erection or placement of buildings and structures. However, the reference to 'resurfacing of land' is potentially confusing. It is unclear why only 'resurfacing' and not 'new' surfacing of land is included in the definition. Further, the definition of 'development' including the 'resurfacing of land' would appear to capture activities that are otherwise specifically exempt from the definition of 'redevelopment of impervious areas'. This creates potential for confusion in the implementation of provisions containing both the terms 'development' and 'redevelopment'.	Amend the definition of development as follows: 'means the erection or placement of buildings and structures, and/or the <del>resurfacing of land creation of new or redevelopment of existing impervious surfaces, excluding those activities otherwise excluded from the definition of 'redevelopment of impervious areas'.</del>	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /GAS TRANSMISSION NETWORK	Georgina McPherson	215.7	Oppose	In Napier, there are existing petroleum pipelines (wharflines and bunkerlines) running between the Port and the bulk fuel storage terminals. These wharflines are primarily located underground, within the public road/footpath. The wharflines are recognised in the Hawkes Bay Regional Resource Management Plan (RRMP) as strategic infrastructure, acknowledging that they are essential for growth and to the well-being, health and safety of people and communities and fall under the RMA definition of 'infrastructure' and the Proposed Plan definition of network utility. Liquid petroleum pipelines, such as the Fuel Companies' wharflines and bunkerlines are distinct to the gas transmission network and should not be included in the definition of 'gas transmission network'. The Fuel Companies consider these facilities are appropriately covered by the definitions of 'infrastructure' and/or 'network utility'.	Amend the definition by deleting the reference to liquid petroleum pipelines, with the effect that the Fuel Companies wharflines and bunkerlines will be covered by plan provisions relating to 'infrastructure' and/or 'network utilities': <u>Gas transmission network</u> <del>any gas or liquid petroleum pipeline with a pressure greater than 2,000 kilopascals, inclusive of any incidental above or below ground equipment which forms part of the transmission network.</del>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /LIGHT INDUSTRIAL ZONE	Georgina McPherson	215.8	Oppose	It is unnecessary and inappropriate to include zones in the definitions section of the plan. The spatial extent of zones is defined by the planning maps and the characteristic of each zone is described in the zone chapters.	Delete the definition of Light Industrial Zone.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /MAINTENANCE (NETWORK UTILITIES)	Georgina McPherson	215.9	Support	The Fuel Companies support the specific recognition of Network Utilities Maintenance and seek that the definition is retained as notified.	Retain the definition of Maintenance (Network Utilities).	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /MINOR UPGRADING OF NETWORK UTILITIES	Georgina McPherson	215.1	Support	The Fuel Companies support the specific recognition of the need to carry out minor upgrades of network utilities and seek that the definition is retained as notified.	Retain the definition of minor upgrading of network utilities.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /PORT RELATED ACTIVITIES	Georgina McPherson	215.11	Amend	The definition is supported in full, with the exception of a minor typo under g(i) which should read as 'freight', as opposed to 'fright'. In particular, the Fuel Companies support the inclusion of c, f and g and seek that these be retained.	Amend spelling mistake under clause g(i) as follows: The use of land and/or buildings for: ... g. Any ancillary activity necessary for the functional needs and operational needs of port operations, or supporting the operation, maintenance, and security of facilities and services, which includes: i. Ancillary operation and maintenance support services including freight and vehicle depots, storage facilities and workshops;	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /REDEVELOPMENT OF IMPERVIOUS AREA	Georgina McPherson	215.12	Amend	Support definition as it provides for essential operational activities without triggering the need to install stormwater management devices. Consider incorporation of standard floor space threshold of 3.5m <sup>2</sup> of above ground network utility structures from NU-S4 to provide exemption for above ground network utility structures to be exempt from stormwater management devices. Specific reference to electric vehicle charging facilities is considered appropriate, as while they are addressed in the network utilities chapter, it is not otherwise clear that they are included in the definition of the term 'network utilities'.	Amend the definition of 'redevelopment of impervious area' to also exclude the installation, maintenance, repair or upgrade of above ground network utilities, as follows. The replacement or reconstruction of a site's lawfully established impervious area, excluding: a. Maintenance or repairs that do not increase the total impervious area of the site, or result in any additional contaminant discharge; b. Resurfacing that does not involve the re-direction of existing stormwater flows or drainage networks; c. Trenching and resurfacing associated with the installation, maintenance, repair and replacement of underground equipment, infrastructure or underground utility works. <u>d. Installation, maintenance, repair or upgrade of above ground network utilities, including electric vehicle charging facilities, having a gross floor area of no more than 3.5m<sup>2</sup>.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /RETAIL ACTIVITY	Georgina McPherson	215.13	Support	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this definition and seek that it is retained.	Retain the definition of Retail activity.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /REVERSE SENSITIVITY	Georgina McPherson	215.14	Amend	The intent of this definition is supported, and with the exception of the word 'vulnerable' the definition is supported in its entirety. The word 'vulnerable' is not supported as it is unnecessary and reduces the clarity of the definition.	Retain definition with the amendment below: means the <del>vulnerable potential for the operation of an existing lawfully established activity to be compromised, constrained, or curtailed by the more recent establishment or alteration of another activity which may be sensitive to the actual, potential, or perceived adverse environmental effects generated by the existing activity or structure.</del>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Georgina McPherson	215.15	Support	The Fuel Companies support this definition and seek that it be retained.	Retain definition of Sensitive activities as notified.	Open Submission



# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /SERVICE STATIONS	Georgina McPherson	215.16	Amend	The Fuel Companies are pleased to see the inclusion of a definition for service stations. The definition is supported, however it lacks reference to electric vehicle charging which is a service that is increasingly being provided as part of service station activities.	Retain the definition of service stations, with the following addition: means a commercial activity on a site where the principal activity is the retail sale of motor vehicle fuels and lubricating oils and includes: a. the sale of kerosene, tyres, batteries and other accessories normally associated with motor vehicles; and/or b. the cleaning of vehicles; and/or c. mechanical and electrical servicing and repair of vehicles; and/or d. ancillary retail of goods and food; and/or e. truck stops; and/or f. trailer hire.; and/or g. <u>the charging of electric vehicles.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /SIGNIFICANT HAZARDOUS FACILITIES	Georgina McPherson	215.17	Amend	The definition of 'significant hazardous facilities' as drafted will capture many service station and truck stop activities and that is opposed. The proposed definition of 'significant hazardous facilities' includes facilities involving the storage/use of more than 100kl petrol and 50kl of diesel. These are arbitrary limits based on historical quantities of products stored at petrol stations. Increasingly, major service stations and truck stops are storing petrol and diesel in higher quantities, for instance 60kl diesel at a truck stop or 120,000kl litres of petrol at a service station. These facilities do not have risks to justify their classification as a Significant Hazardous Facility ( see full submission for more detail).	Amend the definition of Significant Hazardous Facilities to clearly exclude retail services stations and truck stops, the transmission and distribution of petroleum products by pipeline, and fuel storage and servicing installations at airports. This could be achieved by making the following changes, or to the same effect: Means any facility which involves one or more of the following activities: • Manufacturing of hazardous substances (including industries; • manufacturing agrochemicals, fertilisers, acids/alkalis or paints); • Oil and gas exploration and extraction facilities; • The storage/use of more than 10050,000l of petrol; • The storage/use of more than 50100,000l of diesel; • The storage/use of more than 6 tonnes of LPG; • Galvanising plants; • Electroplating and metal treatment facilities; • Tanneries; • Freezing works and rendering plants; • Wastewater treatment plants; • Metal smelting and refining (including battery refining or recycling); • Milk treatment plants; • Fibreglass manufacturing;	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /UPGRADING (NETWORK UTILITIES)	Georgina McPherson	215.18	Support	The Fuel Companies support the definition of Upgrading (Network utilities) and seek that it is retained.	Retain the definition of Upgrading (Network utilities) as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /WAREHOUSING AND STORAGE	Georgina McPherson	215.19	Amend	The intent of this definition is supported by the Fuel Companies.	Retain the definition as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /SIGNIFICANT HAZARDOUS FACILITIES	Georgina McPherson	215.75	Amend	Truck stops and service stations, including those storing more than 50,000 litres of diesel or 100,000 litres of petrol are currently captured by the definition of Significant Hazardous Facilities in the Proposed Plan. It is widely recognised, including by the Ministry for the Environment, that risk associated with these types of facilities is adequately managed by compliance with HSNO and WorkSafe standards together with relevant codes of practice and industry best practice approaches. As identified above, the Fuel Companies seek amendments to the definition of 'significant hazardous facilities' to clearly exclude these activities, including for those exceeding the fuel volume thresholds where storage occurs underground and in accordance with relevant HSNO codes of practice.	Companies seek amendments to the definition of 'significant hazardous facilities' to clearly exclude these activities, including for those exceeding the fuel volume thresholds where storage occurs underground and in accordance with relevant HSNO codes of practice.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /HEAVY INDUSTRY	Georgina McPherson	215.161	Oppose	As previously noted, the definition of 'heavy industry' in the definitions chapter (Part 1 of the Proposed Plan) is ambiguous and should be deleted.	Delete the definiton for 'heavy industry' the definitons chapter (Part 1 of the Proposed Plan).	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /ANCILLARY ACTIVITY	Georgina McPherson	215.175	Support	Ancillary activityThe Fuel Companies support the identified definitions being the same as set out in Section 2 of the Resource Management Act and/or aligning with the definition standards under the National Planning Standards.	Retain as notified the definition of Ancillary Activity	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY	Georgina McPherson	215.176	Support	Commercial activityThe Fuel Companies support the identified definitions being the same as set out in Section 2 of the Resource Management Act and/or aligning with the definition standards under the National Planning Standards.	Retain as notified the definition of Commercial activity in the Proposed Plan	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /CONTAMINANT	Georgina McPherson	215.177	Support	ContaminantThe Fuel Companies support the identified definitions being the same as set out in Section 2 of the Resource Management Act and/or aligning with the definition standards under the National Planning Standards.	Retain as notified the definition of Contaminant	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /CONTAMINATED LAND	Georgina McPherson	215.178	Support	Contaminated landThe Fuel Companies support the identified definitions being the same as set out in Section 2 of the Resource Management Act and/or aligning with the definition standards under the National Planning Standards.	Retain as notified the definition of Contaminated Land	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /DISCHARGE	Georgina McPherson	215.179	Support	DischargeThe Fuel Companies support the identified definitions being the same as set out in Section 2 of the Resource Management Act and/or aligning with the definition standards under the National Planning Standards.	Retain as notified the definition of Discharge	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /DRAIN	Georgina McPherson	215.180	Support	DrainThe Fuel Companies support the identified definitions being the same as set out in Section 2 of the Resource Management Act and/or aligning with the definition standards under the National Planning Standards.	Retain as notified the definition of Drain	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /EARTHWORKS	Georgina McPherson	215.181	Support	EarthworksThe Fuel Companies support the identified definitions being the same as set out in Section 2 of the Resource Management Act and/or aligning with the definition standards under the National Planning Standards.	Retain as notified the definition of Earthworks in the Proposed Plan	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /FUNCTIONAL NEED	Georgina McPherson	215.182	Support	Functional needThe Fuel Companies support the identified definitions being the same as set out in Section 2 of the Resource Management Act and/or aligning with the definition standards under the National Planning Standards.	Retain as notified the definition of Functional Need	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /GROUND LEVEL	Georgina McPherson	215.183	Support	Ground levelThe Fuel Companies support the identified definitions being the same as set out in Section 2 of the Resource Management Act and/or aligning with the definition standards under the National Planning Standards.	Retain as notified the definition of Ground Level	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE	Georgina McPherson	215.184	Support	Hazardous SubstanceThe Fuel Companies support the identified definitions being the same as set out in Section 2 of the Resource Management Act and/or aligning with the definition standards under the National Planning Standards.	Retain as notified the definition of Hazardous Substance	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITY	Georgina McPherson	215.185	Support	Industrial ActivityThe Fuel Companies support the identified definitions being the same as set out in Section 2 of the Resource Management Act and/or aligning with the definition standards under the National Planning Standards.	Retain as notified the definition of Industrial Activity	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /INFRASTRUCTURE	Georgina McPherson	215.186	Support	InfrastructureThe Fuel Companies support the identified definitions being the same as set out in Section 2 of the Resource Management Act and/or aligning with the definition standards under the National Planning Standards.	Retain as notified the definition of Infrastructure	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /LAND DISTURBANCE	Georgina McPherson	215.187	Support	Land DisturbanceThe Fuel Companies support the identified definitions being the same as set out in Section 2 of the Resource Management Act and/or aligning with the definition standards under the National Planning Standards.	Retain as notified the definition of Land Disturbance	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /NAUTRAL HAZARD	Georgina McPherson	215.188	Support	Natural HazardThe Fuel Companies support the identified definitions being the same as set out in Section 2 of the Resource Management Act and/or aligning with the definition standards under the National Planning Standards.	Retain as notified the definition of Natural Hazard	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /NETWORK UTILITY	Georgina McPherson	215.189	Support	Network UtilityThe Fuel Companies support the identified definitions being the same as set out in Section 2 of the Resource Management Act and/or aligning with the definition standards under the National Planning Standards.	Retain as notified the definition of Network Utility	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /NETWORK UTILITY OPERATOR	Georgina McPherson	215.19	Support	Network Utility OperatorThe Fuel Companies support the identified definitions being the same as set out in Section 2 of the Resource Management Act and/or aligning with the definition standards under the National Planning Standards.	Retain as notified the definition of Network Utility Operator in the Proposed Plan	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /NOISE	Georgina McPherson	215.191	Support	NoiseThe Fuel Companies support the identified definitions being the same as set out in Section 2 of the Resource Management Act and/or aligning with the definition standards under the National Planning Standards.	Retain as notified the definition of Noise	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /NOTIONAL BOUNDARY	Georgina McPherson	215.192	Support	Notional BoundaryThe Fuel Companies support the identified definitions being the same as set out in Section 2 of the Resource Management Act and/or aligning with the definition standards under the National Planning Standards.		Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /OFFICIAL SIGN	Georgina McPherson	215.193	Support	Official signThe Fuel Companies support the identified definitions being the same as set out in Section 2 of the Resource Management Act and/or aligning with the definition standards under the National Planning Standards.	Retain as notified the definition of Official Sign	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /OPERATIONAL NEED	Georgina McPherson	215.194	Support	Operational NeedThe Fuel Companies support the identified definitions being the same as set out in Section 2 of the Resource Management Act and/or aligning with the definition standards under the National Planning Standards.	Retain as notified the definition of Operational Need	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /SIGN	Georgina McPherson	215.195	Support	SignThe Fuel Companies support the identified definitions being the same as set out in Section 2 of the Resource Management Act and/or aligning with the definition standards under the National Planning Standards.	Retain as notified the definition of Sign	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /STRUCTURE	Georgina McPherson	215.197	Support	StructureThe Fuel Companies support the identified definitions being the same as set out in Section 2 of the Resource Management Act and/or aligning with the definition standards under the National Planning Standards.	Retain as notified the definition of Structure	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /WASTEWATER	Georgina McPherson	215.198	Support	WastewaterThe Fuel Companies support the identified definitions being the same as set out in Section 2 of the Resource Management Act and/or aligning with the definition standards under the National Planning Standards.	Retain as notified the definition of Wastewater	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /BUILDING	Georgina McPherson	215.2	Support	The definition of Building is supported.	Retain the definition of Building as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /General /General	Anitha Premraj Sam Goddard	216.1	Amend	Considers the inclusion of drive through restaurant activity insufficiently reflected in the current "hospitality activity" definition and fails to recognise that a "drive through facility" is specifically provided for in some zones within the PDP. Considers it critical that definitions appropriately provides for the establishment of future activities	Include definition of a drive through restaurant within the definitions chapter with wording such as below: 'Any land and/or building on or in which food and beverages are prepared, served and sold to the public inclusive of a facility designed to serve customers in their vehicles, for the consumption on or off the premises and may include an ancillary cafe and/or playground area.'	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /ALTERATION OR ADDITION	Shravan Miryala	217.2	Amend	Supports principle of defining additions or alterations specifically for historic heritage buildings and associated activities, however, considers that terms are used in a singular manner: i.e.: just "alterations" which is confusing for Plan users. Also considers that when terms are used throughout the PDP, they appear to relate to activities that do not and likely should not relate to managing effects of additions and alterations to historic heritage buildings. Notes the example that rule TCZ-R9: Additions and alterations, permits (2) external alterations which are less than 25m <sup>2</sup> . The term "alterations" in this PA qualifying condition links back to this definition, which relates to a percentage of change to an historic heritage item. Considers this approach flawed and requires a robust reconsideration as to how the council intends to manage small scale additions and alterations to existing unlisted buildings and structures in the commercial zones.	Amend to rename the defined term as follows Alteration and Addition (Heritage) and remove the hyperlinks to this definition from all rules, standards and other provisions, unless the rule, standard or provision is specifically referring to an identified heritage building or structure.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY	Shravan Miryala	217.3	Support	Supports that the definition of commercial activity is taken directly from the National Planning Standards and supports the intent in the PDP.	Retain this definition as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /General /General	Shravan Miryala	217.4	Oppose	opposes the control of "drive-through facilities" in multiple zones in the PDP without the activity being defined in Part 1. Considers that this term is usually defined, if used in a district plan, And may include or exclude service stations and truck stops. Considers the lack of definition creates confusion and misinterpretation for many vehicle oriented activities.	Insert a new definition for drive-through facilities in the PDP ensuring that it excludes service stations (because they are separately defined).	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /TRANSPORT DEPOT	Shravan Miryala	217.5	Support	Supports of the definition of Transport Depot. Notes that 'vehicle depot' is also used throughout the plan but is not defined. Seeks consistency of the use of the term, or that the term 'vehicle depot' be defined separately if the intended meaning is not the same as 'transport depot.'	Retain the definition of Transport depot and replace the use of vehicle depot' throughout the plan with the defined term of transport depot. Or, alternatively Retain the definition of transport depot and add a new definition for vehicle depot to clearly define differences between the two terms and their subsequent uses throughout the District Plan.	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /SERVICE STATIONS	Shravan Miryala	217.6	Amend	Supports the inclusion and definition for service stations.Considers that it lacks reference to electric vehicle charging which is a service that is increasingly being provided as part of service station activities.	Retain the definition of service stations, with the following addition: means a commercial activity on a site where the principal activity is the retail sale of motor vehicle fuels and lubricating oils <u>and charging of electric vehicles</u> and includes: a. the sale of kerosene, tyres, batteries and other accessories normally associated with motor vehicles; and/or b. the cleaning of vehicles; and/or c. mechanical and electrical servicing and repair of vehicles; and/or d. ancillary retail of goods and food; and/or e. truck stops; and/or f. trailer hire.; and/or <u>g. the charging of electric vehicles.</u> But does not include panel beating, spray painting or heavy engineering.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /SIGNIFICANT HAZARDOUS FACILITIES	Shravan Miryala	217.7	Amend	Supports that the Hazardous Substances chapter provisions apply solely to 'significant hazardous facilities' and hazardous substances in the Natural Open Space Zone. Opposes proposed definition of 'significant hazardous facilities', as it encompasses service station and truck stop activities.Considers that the proposed definition includes arbitrary limits based on historical storage quantities, which may not reflect current practices. Notes that Major service stations and truck stops adhere to HSNO Codes of Practice, managing risks effectively without justifying classification as 'Significant Hazardous Facilities'. The definition lacks a risk-based approach, potentially encompassing facilities with minimal risk justification, for instance a 60kl diesel tank at a truck stop, located either above or below ground. Notes that The Resource Legislation Amendment Act 2017 (RLAA 2017) states councils should control hazardous substances only where effects aren't covered by HSNO or HSWA, implying justification based on effects or risk. Considers that the potential risks associated with 100kl of above ground petrol storage are far more significant than the equivalent in diesel. If there are to be controls on storage then from a risk point of view it would make more sense for the thresholds to be 100kl diesel and 50kl petrol, and only in relation to above ground storage. Also notes that the Operative District Plan definition for 'major hazardous facilities' clearly excludes 'retail service stations and truck stops', therefore the effect of the Proposed Plan definition of 'significant hazardous facilities' would be to apply additional controls to retail service stations and truck stops storing more than 100,000 litres of petrol and/or 50,000 litres diesel. Notes that this has not been justified through s32 analysis and is contrary to the direction provided by the RLAA 2017.	Amend the definition of Significant Hazardous Facilities to clearly exclude retail services stations and truck stops, the transmission and distribution of petroleum products by pipeline, and fuel storage and servicing installations at airports. This could be achieved by making the following changes, or changes to the same effect: Means any facility which involves one or more of the following activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Manufacturing of hazardous substances (including industries;</li> <li>· manufacturing agrochemicals, fertilisers,acids/alkalis or paints);</li> <li>· Oil and gas exploration and extraction facilities;</li> <li>· The storage/use of more than 10050,000l of petrol;</li> <li>· The storage/use of more than 50100,000l of diesel;</li> <li>· The storage/use of more than 6 tonnes of LPG;</li> <li>· Galvanising plants; Electroplating and metal treatment facilities;</li> <li>· Tanneries;</li> <li>· Freezing works and rendering plants;</li> <li>· Wastewater treatment plants;</li> <li>· Metal smelting and refining (including batteryrefining or recycling);</li> <li>· Milk treatment plants;</li> <li>· Fibreglass manufacturing;</li> <li>· Polymer foam manufacturing;</li> <li>· Asphalt/bitumen manufacture or storage; or</li> </ul>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /PRIMARY PRODUCTION	Dominic Adams	221.1	Amend	Napier City is surrounded by rural areas that support the regional economy - including via primary production. Agricultural aviation is a vital tool supporting farmers and growers to protect and maintain primary production therefore Ballance seeks to have agricultural aviation recognised and provided for in the plan.	Seeks to Amend to add new definition: <u>Agricultural aviation activity means the intermittent operation of an aircraft from a rural airstrip or helicopter landing area for primary production, frost mitigation, biosecurity, or biodiversity purposes including stock management, and the application of fertiliser, agrichemicals, or vertebrate toxic agents (VTA's). For clarity, aircraft includes fixed-wing aeroplanes, helicopters, and unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV's).</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /	Dominic Adams	221.2	Support	Ballance agrees with the definition of primary production.	Seeks to retain definition.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /	Dominic Adams	221.3	Amend	It is important for rural airstrips to be defined in the plan so that they can be considered appropriately.	Seeks to Amend to add definition: <u>Rural airstrip means any defined area of land intended or designed to be used, whether wholly or partly, for the landing, departure, movement, or servicing of aircraft in the rural area.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /	Amelia Longley	222.18	Amend	Insert new definition for 'Conservation Activities' to support proposed amendments requesting a new Rule in NOSZ chapter.	<u>CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES means the use of land and/or buildings for any activity undertaken for the purposes of maintaining, protecting and/or enhancing the natural, historic and/or ecological values of a natural or historic resource. It includes ancillary activities and activities which assist to enhance the public's appreciation and recreational enjoyment of the resource.</u>	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /	Amelia Longley	222.19	Amend	There is no definition in the Proposed District Plan for Informal Recreation. Propose to have a definition included.	New Definition: <u>INFORMAL RECREATION - Means an activity whose aim is the enjoyment of leisure of a primarily non-competitive casual nature and includes for example: resting, sitting, walking, cycling, jogging, outdoor community events etc.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /PUBLIC AMENITIES	Amelia Longley	222.20	Amend	Unclear what a public amenity 'devices or items' is, and why these would be singled out in a definition, therefore seek these references be deleted. Signage is controlled by the DWA SIGN - Sign chapter, referencing it in this definition would lead to confusion in applying the rules. Amendments also seek to clarify public amenities are a subset of community facilities.	<u>means a structure, device or item used for the purpose of the public's enjoyment, convenience, or comfort, and may include toilet facilities, shelters, signage, rubbish bins, tracks, platforms, and structures relating to educational or informational purposes.</u> <u>Also refer: Community facilities.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /RECREATIONAL ACTIVITY	Amelia Longley	222.21	Amend	Delete reference to public conveniences as they are now proposed to be covered under the definition of 'public amenities'. Reference to outdoor school grounds not appropriate here. This would more appropriately be addressed under the definition of 'educational facilities'. Amend to provide for 'ancillary activities' in a manner similar to the definition of 'community facility'.	means any land and/or buildings whose primary use is for passive or active leisure, whether competitive or non-competitive, casual or organised, including (but not limited to) shelter, cycleways and walkways outside roads, <del>public conveniences, the use of outdoor school grounds between the hours of sunrise and sunset, and other accessory buildings and any activity ancillary to the recreational activity.</del> <u>Also refer:</u> - <u>Community facilities</u> - <u>Entertainment activities / Events /</u> - <u>Public amenities</u> <u>Note: Commercial components of an activity on Council reserves may also trigger provisions in the Reserves Act 1977</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /	Amelia Longley	222.22	Amend	Insert new definition to support proposed amendments requesting a new Rule in the Open Spaces Zones providing for 'Reserves Maintenance Activities' The PDP does not currently provide for buildings and activities associated with the maintenance, management and development of the City's parks and open spaces. Whilst these could be considered to be activities ancillary to the main purpose of the zone, for clarity inclusion of a separate activity and associated rule is sought.	<u>RESERVES MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES: Activities including buildings, for the maintenance, management and development of the City's parks and open spaces network including equipment and storage sheds, nurseries, and administration offices.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /	Amelia Longley	222.23	Amend	New definition sought to provide for 'stormwater and drainage activities' undertaken by Council pursuant to its duties under the Land Drainage Act 1904, the Local Government Act 2002 or the Reserves Act 1977. Include a new definition (and associated rule in the Open Spaces Zones) for 'Stormwater and Drainage Activities'.		Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /TEMPORARY NOISE EVENTS	Amelia Longley	222.24	Amend	In the STADZ Zone refers to a noise event. Unclear whether this is the same as a temporary noise event? Clarify the use of this term and its relationship with 'entertainment activities'/'noise event' as set out in Rule STADZ- R4/Standard STADZ-S6 of the stadium zone.	TEMPORARY NOISE EVENT An event that exceeds the general noise controls for a site (or area within the coastal marine area) either in level or duration.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /	Amelia Longley	222.141	Amend	Insert new definition to support proposed amendments requesting a new Rule in STADZ Zone.	EVENT (Stadium Zone): Means an activity, either indoor or outdoor, that takes place on McLean Park and involves large groups of people either as participants or spectators and includes trade fairs, , open days, displays, wedding celebrations, social functions conferences and the like.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /TRANSPORT DEPOT	Alicia McKinnon	230.9	Amend	The definition of Transport depot should be amended to be consistent with the current definition in the Napier Operative District Plan.	seeks to amend the definition of Transport Depot as follows: means any land and/or buildings which is primarily used for the receipt, dispatch, or consolidation of goods in transit being transported by road and/or air, where the goods are not owned or processed by the owner or occupier of that land or building, <u>and includes a carrier's depot and truckstop.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /ACTIVITIES SENSITIVE TO AIRCRAFT NOISE	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.2	Support	The Ministry supports the inclusion of day care facilities, educational facilities and child care centres in the definition of 'activities sensitive to aircraft noise', as they are activities sensitive to noise. The Ministry acknowledges that there is a valid reason for excluding educational facilities that have an aviation purpose and supports this.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /ACTIVITIES SENSITIVE TO NOISE	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.3	Amend	Requests to change the definition to encompass all environments at educational facilities rather than restricting this to classrooms. outdoor environments are a key part of educational facilities. Most schools have curriculums that are taught outside. making it important to protect outside environments from noise. Recommend that the term education facilities be changed to educational facilities, for maintained consistency.	Seeks to amend definition to say: Means any dwelling, visitor accommodation, boarding house, marae, papakāinga, integrated residential development, retirement village, supported residential care, care centres, lecture theatres in tertiary education facilities, <u>classrooms in educational facilities</u> , and healthcare facilities with an overnight stay facility.	Open Submission
Definitions /General /General	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.4	Amend	Amend definitions to include a new definition of additional infrastructure to the plan, which is derived from the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (MPS-UD).The definition for 'Infrastructure' does not include educational facilities. Under the NPS-UD educational facilities are included in the definition of 'additional infrastructure'. The Ministry recommends the inclusion of 'additional infrastructure' in the definitions chapter to provide for educational facilities. This will ensure that subdivision and development include provision for the expansion of existing or new educational facilities to accommodate the demand of the development.It will allow for activities that provide broadly for communities' social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety, to be captured within specific policies and objectives and will be consistent with the NPS-UD wording.	Seeks to Amend Infrastructure Definition to: <u>Additional infrastructure means:</u> a. <u>Public open space.</u> b. <u>Community infrastructure as defined in section 197 of the Local Government Act 2002.</u> c. <u>Land transport (as defined in the Land Transport Management Act 2003) that is not controlled by local authorities.</u> d. <u>Social infrastructure, such as schools and healthcare facilities.</u> e. <u>A network operated for the purpose of telecommunications (as defined in section 5 of the Telecommunications Act 2001).</u> f. <u>A network operated for the purpose of transmitting or distributing electricity or gas.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /AIRPORT RELATED ACTIVITIES	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.5	Amend	The Ministry supports the inclusion of 'educational facilities' solely related to aviation to be included in the definition of Airport related activities, which aims to protect airport activities.Request that 'education facilities' be amended to read 'educational facilities' for consistency across the plan.	Seeks that t 'education facilities' be amended to read 'educational facilities' for consistency across the plan. means third party ancillary activities or services that provide support to the airport. This includes: a. land transport activities; b. buildings and structures; c. servicing and infrastructure; d. police stations, fire stations, and medical facilities; e. <u>educational facilities</u> provided they serve an aviation related purpose; f. retail and commercial services and industry associated with the needs of Airport passengers, visitors and employees and/or aircraft movements and Airport businesses, and g. Administrative offices, provided they are ancillary to an airport or airport related activity.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /EDUCATIONAL FACILITY	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.6	Support	The Ministry supports the definitons for 'Educational facility' as it is consistent with the National Planning Standards.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /HABITABLE ROOM	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.7	Support	The Ministry supports the proposed definiton for Habitable Room as it is consistent with the National Planning Standards.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /NOISE SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.8	Amend	Supports the inclusion of educational facilities in the definition of noise sensitive activity, which aims to protect educational facilities form noise. Understands that trade and industry training is excluded from this definition. Seeks to amend definition to read educational facilities rather than education facilities.	Amend definition to: Any use of land and/or buildings which is likely to be susceptible to the effects of noise emitted from nearby land uses in the course of their legitimate operation and functioning; and for the purposes of this plan, includes day care centres, educational facilities (but not any trade training or other industry- related <u>educational</u> facility), health care centres, hospitality activities, office accommodation, places of assembly, residential activities, retirement complexes, travellers' accommodation, and camping grounds	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /RECREATIONAL ACTIVITY	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.9	Amend	Opposes the inclusion of 'use of outdoor school grounds between the hours of sunrise and sunset'. Some schools have evening events after dark, which utilise field lighting, which can be used for trainings for games during the winter. Requests that this part of the definition is removed.	Seeks to amend definition as follows: Any use of land and/or buildings which is likely to be susceptible to the effects of noise emitted from nearby land uses in the course of their legitimate operation and functioning; and for the purposes of this plan, includes day care centres, educational facilities (but not any trade training or other industry- related <u>educational</u> facility), health care centres, hospitality activities, office accommodation, places of assembly, residential activities, retirement complexes, travellers' accommodation, and camping grounds.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.10	Support	The Ministry supports the inclusion of educational facilities in the definition of "sensitive activities".This proposed definition is acceptable and provides protection to educational facilities.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /KŌHANGA REO	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.11	Support	The Ministry supports the inclusion of this definiton. The definiton of educational facility includes day care centres which reflects a broad range of activities, including Kōhanga reo.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /MĀORI PURPOSE ACTIVITIES	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.12	Amend	Amend definition as it does not include Kura or Kōhanga Reo. Both Māori schools and childcare services should also be specifically provided for under this definition. Including both terms is important, as Māori purpose activities are enabled in the Māori purpose zone as permitted activities. All Māori educational facilities should be permitted in the Māori purpose zone.	Seeks to Amend definition to: Means activities relating to the expression and revitalisation of Māori culture, including mahinga kai activities, performing arts/sporting activities, tangihanga and other mourning activities, Matariki and Pūanga observance activities, wānanga, <u>kura, kōhanga reo</u> , hui, shorter-term (under seven days) events or festivals, temporary (under 14 days) camping that facilitates involvement in Māori customary activities, and other activities that reflect the special relationship mana whenua have to place, including any ancillary structures.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.13	Amend	The Ministry request a new definiton is included to outline who vulnerable road users are. The Ministry have recommended this term be used in the plan.	Amend to: <u>Vulnerable users</u> <u>Means non-motorised road users, such as pedestrians, cyclists, children, the elderly, the disabled and users of mobility devices.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Sam Goddard	238.1	Amend	Considers it critical that the definitions section of the PDP is well informed and appropriately provides for the establishment of future activities.The PDP does not currently include a definition of a supermarket activity. It is unclear whether a supermarket falls within the definition of a “retail activity” or “commercial activity”. Both of these categories are broad and do not provide a clear understanding of the activities anticipated. The inclusion of a standardised definition at the district-wide level to provide for a consistent approach is considered to be important.	Include definition of a supermarket activity within the definitions chapter with wording such as: ‘An individual retail outlet, which sells, primarily by way of self service, a comprehensive range of: a. domestic supplies, fresh food and groceries, such as: fresh meat and produce; chilled, frozen, packaged, canned and bottled foodstuffs and beverages; general housekeeping and personal goods, including (but not limited to) cooking, cleaning and washing products, kitchenwares, toilet paper, diapers and other paper tissue products, pharmaceutical, health and personal hygiene products and other toiletries, and cigarettes, magazine and newspapers, greeting cards and stationery, batteries, flashlights, light bulbs and related products; and b. non domestic supplies and comparison goods comprising not more than 20 per cent of all products offered for sale as measured by retail floor space, including (but not limited to): barbecue and heating fuels; audio visual products; electrical appliances; clothing and footwear; furniture; and office supplies.’	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Sam Goddard	238.2	Amend	Considers it critical that the definitons secton of the PDP is well informed and appropriately provides for the establishment of future activities.The PDP does not currently include a definition of a wholesaler.It is unclear if a Gilmours (wholesaler) falls within the definition of a “industrial activity”, “retail activity” or “commercial activity”.Both of these categories are broad and do not provide a clear understanding of the activities anticipated. The inclusion of a standardised definition at the district-wide level to provide for a consistent approach is considered to be important.	Include definition of a wholesaler within the definitions chapter with wording such as: ‘A business engaged in the storage and distribution of goods to businesses (including retail activities) and institutional customers. Sales to the public are an accessory activity.’	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /MAINTENANCE (NETWORK UTILITIES)	Angela Jones	240.2	Amend	Seeks the inclusion of tree trimming and weed control within the definition as these are regular maintenance activities undertaken by the submitter, in addition to other activities included in the proposed definition.	Include tree trimming and weed control within the definition of Maintenance (network utilities)	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /POLE	Angela Jones	240.3	Amend	Seeks amendments to the definition to make it consistent with the definition of pole in the NPS-ET which includes reference to the hardware associated with the structure (e.g.: cross-arms and guy wires).	Amend the definition to include: <u>It includes the hardware associated with the structure (such as insulators, cross-arms, and guy-wires) and the structure's foundations.</u>	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /General	Angela Jones	240.4	Amend	Seeks the inclusion of the definition of 'customer connection' to be sought, as the proposed rules for network utilities do not explicitly permit lines extending from the road to customers houses.	Include a new definition: CUSTOMER CONNECTION <u>Means a line that connects a telecommunications or electricity distribution network or a pipe that connects a gas distribution network to a site, including any connection to a building within that site, for the purpose of enable a network utility operator to provide telecommunications, electrical or gas services to a customer.</u> Consequential changes to the Network Utilities chapter are also sought for the inclusion of 'customer connection' as a permitted activity.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /ACTIVITIES SENSITIVE TO NOISE	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.4	Oppose	Opposes the Definition of 'Activities Sensitive To Noise' given that there are two definitions listing similar but different activities that are likely to be sensitive to noise with a reliance on two differing definitions within different sections of the PDP considered to be problematic. Only one such term should be used throughout the PDP.	Delete the notified definition of 'Activities Sensitive To Noise' as follows: <del>means any dwelling, visitor accommodation, boarding house, marae, papakāinga, integrated residential development, retirement village, supported residential care, care centres, lecture theatres in tertiary education facilities, classrooms in education facilities, and healthcare facilities with an overnight stay facility.</del> AND, Rely on and use the notified definition of 'Noise Sensitive Activities', instead of the 'Activities Sensitive To Noise' definition, throughout the PDP. AND, Consequential amendments throughout the PDP.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /FERTILISER	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.5	Support	Supports the Definition of 'Fertiliser' in the PDP as this is consistent with the National Planning Standards (NPS).	Retain the Definition of 'Fertiliser' as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /HEAVY INDUSTRY	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.6	Support	Supports the Definition of 'Heavy Industry' as it reflects the general understanding of the nature of heavy industrial activities. The definition is also considered to be generally consistent with the NPS's description of activities that would be present in a Heavy Industrial Zone (where such zones are included in statutory plans) (Section 8 and Table 13 of the NPS).	Retain the definition of 'Heavy Industry' as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /IMPERVIOUS AREA	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.7	Support	Supports the Definition of 'Impervious Area' as accurately reflecting the nature of impervious areas.	Retain the definition of 'Impervious Area' as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /INDUSTRIAL WASTE AND TRADE WASTE	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.8	Support	The submitter supports the definition of 'Industrial Waste and Trade Waste' as the same as that provided in the NPS.	Retain the definition of 'Industrial Waste and Trade Waste' as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /LIGHT INDUSTRIAL ZONE	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.9	Oppose	Opposes the Definition of 'Light Industrial Zone' as the inclusion of this definition is inconsistent with the approach to zone descriptions in the PDP, in that, with the exception of 'Centre Zone', definitions are not included for any of the PDP's other zones. Rather the nature and character of the city's various zones are described in the introduction, as well as objectives and policies, contained in each zone 'chapter' of the PDP. Given the context provided within each zone 'chapter' (including the 'Light Industrial Zone' chapter of the PDP), providing definitions of any zone, including a definition of the 'light industrial zone' is not required. This approach is consistent with the NPS which provide definitions for zones but does provide descriptions for zone names (Section 8 and Table 13 of the NPS). The proposed PDP definition of 'light industrial zone' generally reflects the zone description contained in the NPS.	Delete the notified definition of 'Light Industrial Zone'.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /NOISE SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.10	Support	The submitter supports the Definition of 'Noise Sensitive Activity' as the PDP contains definitions for both 'Activities Sensitive To Noise' and 'Noise Sensitive Activities' with these two definitions listing similar but different activities that are likely to be sensitive to noise. Reliance on two differing definitions within different sections of the PDP is considered to be problematic. It is proposed that the PDP continues to rely on the 'Noise Sensitive Activity' definition as notified. This is primarily as this is the definition contained in the Operative Plan and therefore the community will largely be familiar with the implications of this term.	Retain the definition of 'Noise Sensitive Activity' as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /REDEVELOPMENT OF IMPERVIOUS AREA	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.11	Support	Supports the Definition of 'Redevelopment of Impervious Area' as the definition clearly outlines activities that do not constitute redevelopment of impervious areas (i.e., activities that do not result in more stormwater being generated and discharged).	Retain the definition of 'Redevelopment Of Impervious Area' as notified.	Open Submission



# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /REVERSE SENSITIVITY	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.12	Support	Supports the Definition of 'Reverse Sensitivity' as for Ravensdown, given the presence of its Napier Works which is a heavy industrial activity appropriately located in an industrial zone, providing for the effective management of reverse sensitivity effects on Ravensdown's lawfully established activities, within the PDP, is important. For this reason, including a definition which effectively describes what reverse sensitivity is, is important.	Retain the definition of 'Reverse Sensitivity' as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.13	Support	Supports the Definition for 'Sensitive Activities' as irrespective of national variability, the PDP's proposed definition effectively reflects the nature of activities that are sensitive to adverse effects associated with other lawful activities located in industrial zones.	Retain the definition of 'Sensitive Activities' as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /SIGNIFICANT HAZARDOUS FACILITIES	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.14	Oppose	Opposes the definition for 'Significant Hazardous Facilities' as given the controls in place under HSNOA and various regulations, there is no need for additional regulatory control on the storage and use of hazardous substances under the PDP. In addition, the proposed PDP definition does not seem to be consistent with the evaluative process required under the Health and Safety at Work (Major Hazard Facilities) Regulations 2016 (MHF) to determine whether or not a facility is a MHF (plus the process for determining lower or upper tier MHFs). For these reasons, the deletion of this definition is requested as well as the deletion of this term from the associated HAZS Section Rules.	Delete the definition of 'Significant Hazardous Facilities' as follows: <del>Means any facility which involves one or more of the following activities:</del> <del>— Manufacturing of hazardous substances (including industries; manufacturing agrochemicals, fertilisers, acids/alkalis or paints);</del> <del>— Oil and gas exploration and extraction facilities;</del> <del>— The storage/use of more than 100,000l of petrol;</del> <del>— The storage/use of more than 50,000l of diesel;</del> <del>— The storage/use of more than 6 tonnes of LPG;</del> <del>— Galvanising plants;</del> <del>— Electroplating and metal treatment facilities;</del> <del>— Tanneries;</del> <del>— Freezing works and rendering plants;</del> <del>— Wastewater treatment plants;</del> <del>— Metal smelting and refining (including battery refining or recycling);</del> <del>— Milk treatment plants;</del> <del>— Fibreglass manufacturing;</del> <del>— Polymer foam manufacturing;</del> <del>— Asphalt/bitumen manufacture or storage; or</del> <del>— Landfills.</del> AND, Consequential amendments throughout the PDP.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /SITE	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.15	Support	Supports the definition of 'Site' as it is the same as that provided in the NPS.	Retain the definition of 'Site' as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /STORMWATER	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.16	Support	Supports the definition of 'Stormwater' as being the same as that provided in the NPS.	Retain the definition of 'Stormwater' as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /SWALE	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.17	Oppose	Opposes the definition for 'Swale' as the proposed definition is problematic, particularly as it infers that a swale equates to the formation of a watercourse (i.e., this could be inferred to mean that a new 'surface water body' has been constructed). The definition is also too simplistic and is not sufficiently nuanced.	Delete the notified definition of 'Swale' as follows: <del>means an area of land that has been shaped to allow a watercourse to form during stormwater collection.</del>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /WET INDUSTRY	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.18	Oppose	Opposes the proposed PDP definition of a 'Wet Industry' as it is an inaccurate description of so-called wet industries, in that it is not necessary for industrial activities that use process water, such as Ravensdown's Napier Works, to be connected to a trade waste network. While industries that use process water then generally generate wastewater that requires treatment and disposal, for some industries it is feasible and environmentally sustainable for on-site wastewater treatment and disposal to be used (subject to compliance with regional council permitted activity rules or discharge permits). This is the case for Ravensdown's Napier Works. On this basis, the PDP's proposed definition of 'wet industry' is not correct and therefore should be deleted. In addition, there is no need to differentiate between heavy and/or wet industries in the PDP, and that only the term 'heavy industry', based on the PDP definition proposed, should be used throughout the PDP.	Delete the notified definition of 'Wet Industry' as follows: <del>Industry that requires process water and a connection to the trade waste network.</del> AND, Consequential amendments throughout the PDP.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /PORT RELATED ACTIVITIES	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.41	Support	Supports the definition of 'Port Related Activities' as Ravensdown operates a bulk store at Napier Port and its operations at the port are appropriately accommodated within the definition. Therefore, the proposed definition is supported.	Retain the definition of 'Port Related Activities', including clauses (c) and (f) of the definition, as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /General /General	Phil Stickney	247.2	Oppose	Considers that including a definition that guides users in respect of what constitutes a habitable room. Guidance on this matter is contained in Part 14 of the National Planning Standards	Amend the definitions to include the definition set out in Part 14 of the National Planning Standards to be included within The Plan.	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
<p>Definitions /Definitions /RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY</p> <p>means the use of land and/or buildings such as an old persons' home, convalescent home, nursing home, rest home, women's or men's refuge, hospital, hostel, or charitable institution in which board and lodging or lodging alone is provided or intended to be provided. This does not include a day care centre, travellers' accommodation, or a retirement complex.</p>	Ana Ika	250.1	Oppose	Considers the importance of housing for the well-being of vulnerable whanau in the community and concerns regarding the Residential Care Facility Definition. Opposes the inclusion of "charitable institution" from the definition considering the application of the definition in GRZ-R6 and Consent Processes could hinder operations and impede capacity to support vulnerable whanau in Napier. Refer to original submission for full background.	Seeks the deletion of "charitable institution" from the definition of a residential care facility.	Open Submission
<p>Definitions /Definitions /BED</p> <p>has the same meaning as in section 2 of the RMA (as below):</p> <p>means—</p> <p>in relation to any river—</p> <p>for the purposes of esplanade reserves, esplanade strips, and subdivision, the space of land which the waters of the river cover at its annual fullest flow without overtopping its banks: in all other cases, the space of land which the waters of the river cover at its fullest flow without overtopping its banks; and</p> <p>in relation to any lake, except a lake controlled by artificial means,—</p> <p>for the purposes of esplanade reserves, esplanade strips, and subdivision, the space of land which the waters of the lake cover at its annual highest level without exceeding its margin: in all other cases, the space of land which the waters of the lake cover at its highest level without exceeding its margin; and</p> <p>in relation to any lake controlled by artificial means, the space of land which the waters of the lake cover at its maximum permitted operating level; and</p> <p>in relation to the sea, the submarine areas covered by the internal waters and the territorial sea.</p>	Trevor Ellis	253.5	Support	The definition implements the Act.	Retain as notified	Open Submission
<p>Definitions /Definitions /BEST PRACTICABLE OPTION</p> <p>has the same meaning as in section 2 of the RMA (as below):</p> <p>in relation to a discharge of a contaminant or an emission of noise, means the best method for preventing or minimising the adverse effects on the environment having regard, among other things, to—</p> <p>the nature of the discharge or emission and the sensitivity of the receiving environment to adverse effects; and the financial implications, and the effects on the environment, of that option when compared with other options; and the current state of technical knowledge and the likelihood that the option can be successfully applied.</p>	Trevor Ellis	253.6	Support	The definition implements the Act.	Retain as notified	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
<p>Definitions /Definitions /COASTAL MARINE AREA has the same meaning as in section 2 of the RMA (as below): means the foreshore, seabed, and coastal water, and the air space above the water:</p> <p>of which the seaward boundary is the outer limits of the territorial sea; of which the landward boundary is the line of mean high water springs, except that where that line crosses a river, the landward boundary at that point shall be whichever is the lesser of: 1 kilometre upstream from the mouth of the river; or the point upstream that is calculated by multiplying the width of the river mouth by 5.</p>	Trevor Ellis	253.7	Support	The definition implements the Act.	Retain as notified	Open Submission
<p>Definitions /Definitions /ENVIRONMENT has the same meaning as in section 2 of the RMA (as below): includes—</p> <p>ecosystems and their constituent parts, including people and communities; and all natural and physical resources; and amenity values; and the social, economic, aesthetic, and cultural conditions which affect the matters stated in paragraphs (a) to (c) or which are affected by those matters.</p>	Trevor Ellis	253.8	Support	The definition implements the Act.	Retain as notified	Open Submission
<p>Definitions /Definitions /ESPLANADE RESERVE has the same meaning as in section 2 of the RMA (as below): means a reserve within the meaning of the Reserves Act 1977—</p> <p>which is either— a local purpose reserve within the meaning of section 23 of that Act, if vested in the territorial authority under section 239; or a reserve vested in the Crown or a regional council under section 237D; and which is vested in the territorial authority, regional council, or the Crown for a purpose or purposes set out in section 229.</p>	Trevor Ellis	253.9	Support	The definition implements the Act.	Retain as notified	Open Submission
<p>Definitions /Definitions /ESPLANADE STRIP has the same meaning as in section 2 of the RMA (as below): means a strip of land created by the registration of an instrument in accordance with section 232 for a purpose or purposes set out in section 229.</p>	Trevor Ellis	253.10	Support	The definition implements the Act.	Retain as notified	Open Submission
<p>Definitions /Definitions /NATURAL AND PHYSICAL RESOURCES has the same meaning as in section 2 of the RMA (as below):</p> <p>Includes land, water, air, soil, minerals, and energy, all forms of plants and animals (whether native to New Zealand or introduced), and all structures.</p>	Trevor Ellis	253.11	Support	Supports as the definition implements the Act.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREA has the same meaning as in the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity 2023 (NPSIB) and means:  any area that, after the commencement date [of the NPSIB], is notified or included in a district plan as an Significant Natural Area (SNA) following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 1; and any area that, on the commencement date [of the NPSIB], is already identified in a policy statement or plan as an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna (regardless of how it is described); in which case it remains as an SNA unless or until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by the relevant local authority determines that it is not an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna.	Trevor Ellis	253.12	Support	Supports as the definition implements the NPS-IB 2023.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /WATER has the same meaning as in section 2 of the RMA (as below): means water in all its physical forms whether flowing or not and whether over or under the ground: includes fresh water, coastal water, and geothermal water: does not include water in any form while in any pipe, tank, or cistern.	Trevor Ellis	253.13	Support	Supports as the definition implements the Act.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /WATER SENSITIVE DESIGN Means an interdisciplinary approach to land use and development planning, design and implementation which integrates land use and water management, to minimise adverse effects on freshwater systems and coastal environments, particularly from stormwater runoff	Trevor Ellis	253.14	Amend	Considers that while the definition is supported in principle it should be amended to more closely align with the NPS-FM and NZCPS.	Amend as follows: Water Sensitive Design Means an interdisciplinary approach to land use and development planning, design and implementation which integrates land use and water management, to <u>avoid, remedy, and</u> minimise adverse effects on freshwater systems and coastal environments, particularly from stormwater runoff	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /WATERBODY has the same meaning as in section 2 of the RMA (as below): means fresh water or geothermal water in a river, lake, stream, pond, wetland, or aquifer, or any part thereof, that is not located within the coastal marine area.	Trevor Ellis	253.15	Support	Supports as the definition implements the Act.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /WETLAND has the same meaning as in section 2 of the RMA (as below): includes permanently or intermittently wet areas, shallow water, and land water margins that support a natural ecosystem of plants and animals that are adapted to wet conditions.	Trevor Ellis	253.16	Support	Supports as the definition implements the Act.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Trevor Ellis	253.17	Amend	Considers that the interpretation section has several missing definitions that would assist in increasing clarity in so far as the Plan is concerned. The National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity 2023 provides several definitions that should be implemented to give effect to it. NCC has stated that they will implement the NPS-IB in a later Variation but currently include several definitions from the NPS-IB already such as Significant Natural Area. To ensure that biodiversity is protected in the meantime before the Variation is notified, there should be further definitions included from the NPS-IB.	Seeks to amend the definitions section to include definitions from the NPS-IB 2023.	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /General	Trevor Ellis	253.18	Amend	Considers that a definition of biodiversity compensation should be included from the NPS-IB to assist in implementing the higher order document.	Seeks to insert the following definition into the Plan: <u>Biodiversity compensation</u> means a conservation outcome that meets the requirements in Appendix 4 and results from actions that are intended to compensate for any more than minor residual adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity after all appropriate avoidance, minimisation, remediation, and biodiversity offsetting measures have been sequentially applied.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Trevor Ellis	253.19	Amend	Considers that a definition of biodiversity offset should be included from the NPS-IB to assist in implementing the higher order document.	Seeks to insert the following definition into the Plan: <u>Biodiversity offset</u> means a measurable conservation outcome that meets the requirements in Appendix 3 and results from actions that are intended to: (a) redress any more than minor residual adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity after all appropriate avoidance, minimisation, and remediation measures have been sequentially applied; and (b) achieve a net gain in type, amount, and condition of indigenous biodiversity compared to that lost	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Trevor Ellis	253.2	Amend	Considers that as the term “coastal environment” is used throughout the plan, it should be defined using Policy 1 of the NZCPS.	Seeks to insert an updated definition of Coastal Environment as per Policy 1 of the NZCPS 2010: <u>Coastal environment</u> means an environment in which the coast is a significant element or part, and includes: (a) the coastal marine area; (b) islands within the coastal marine area; (c) areas where coastal processes, influences or qualities are significant, including coastal lakes, lagoons, tidal estuaries, saltmarshes, coastal wetlands, and the margins of these; (d) areas at risk from coastal hazards; (e) coastal vegetation and the habitat of indigenous coastal species including migratory birds;(f) elements and features that contribute to the natural character, landscape, visual qualities or amenity values;(g) items of cultural and historic heritage in the coastal marine and terrestrial systems, including the intertidal zone; and(h) physical resources and built facilities, including infrastructure, that have modified the coastal environment	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Trevor Ellis	253.21	Amend	considers that as the term “conservation activity” is used throughout the Plan, a definition should be provided so its meaning is clear.	seeks to insert the following definition into the Plan: <u>Conservation Activities</u> means the use of land and buildings for any activity undertaken for the purposes of maintaining, protecting or enhancing the natural, historic or ecological values of a natural or historic resource on reserve, conservation or land covenanted for reserve or conservation purposes. It includes ancillary activities and activities which assist to enhance the public's appreciation and recreational enjoyment of the resource such as: • Restoration planting • Pest and weed control • Track construction and maintenance • Plant nurseries to support the above purposes	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /General	Trevor Ellis	253.22	Amend	The Effects Management Hierarchy is a tool provided by the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity 2023. Several chapters of the Plan refer to indigenous biodiversity regardless of whether the ECO chapter has been notified.Considers that the insertion of the Effects management hierarchy now will provide guidance on how indigenous biodiversity should be treated until the ECO chapter is notified.	seeks to insert the definition of “effects management hierarchy” as written in the NPS-IB 2023: <u>effects management hierarchy means an approach to managing the adverse effects of an activity on indigenous biodiversity that requires that: (a) adverse effects are avoided where practicable; then (b) where adverse effects cannot be avoided, they are minimised where practicable; then (c) where adverse effects cannot be minimised, they are remedied where practicable; then (d) where more than minor residual adverse effects cannot be avoided, minimised, or remedied, biodiversity offsetting is provided where possible; then (e) where biodiversity offsetting of more than minor residual adverse effects is not possible, biodiversity compensation is provided; then(f) if biodiversity compensation is not appropriate, the activity itself is avoided.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Trevor Ellis	253.23	Amend	considers that as the term “habitat” is used throughout the Plan outside of the forthcoming ECO chapter, a definition should be inserted to provide clarity. It is suggested that the definition of Indigenous vegetation in the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity 2023 should be used.	seeks to insert the definition of “habitat” as written in the NPS-IB: <u>habitat means the area or environment where an organism or ecological community lives or occurs naturally for some or all of its life cycle, or as part of its seasonal feeding or breeding pattern; but does not include built structures or an area or environment where an organism is present only fleetingly</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Trevor Ellis	253.24	Amend	considers that as the term “Indigenous biodiversity” is used throughout the Plan outside of the forthcoming ECO chapter, a definition should be inserted to provide clarity. It is suggested that the definition of Indigenous biodiversity in the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity 2023 should be used.	seeks to insert the definition of “Indigenous Biodiversity” as written in the NPS-IB: <u>indigenous biodiversity means the living organisms that occur naturally in New Zealand, and the ecological complexes of which they are part, including all forms of indigenous flora, fauna, and fungi, and their habitats</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Trevor Ellis	253.25	Amend	considers that as the term “Indigenous vegetation” is used throughout the Plan outside of the forthcoming ECO chapter, a definition should be inserted to provide clarity. It is suggested that the definition of Indigenous vegetation in the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity 2023 should be used.	seeks to insert the definition of “indigenous vegetation” as written in the NPS-IB: <u>indigenous vegetation means vascular and non-vascular plants that, in relation to a particular area, are native to the ecological district in which that area is located</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Trevor Ellis	253.26	Amend	considers that as the term “Species” is used throughout the Plan outside of the forthcoming ECO chapter, a definition should be inserted to provide clarity. It is suggested that the definition of species in the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity 2023 should be used.	seeks to insert the definition of “species” as written in the NPS- IB: <u>species means a group of living organisms consisting of similar individuals capable of freely exchanging genes or interbreeding, including subspecies, varieties and organisms that are indeterminate.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /ACTIVITIES SENSITIVE TO NOISE	Leanne Roberts	257.1	Amend	Considers the definition of dwelling is not defined in the plan. Suggests the term residential activity should be used, as this would be consistent with the definition for activities sensitive to aircraft noise.	Seeks to amend definition of 'activities sensitive to noise' as follows: <u>Means any dwelling residential activity visitor accommodation, boarding house, marae, papakāinga, integrated residential development, retirement village, supported residential care, care centres, lecture theatres in tertiary education facilities, classroom in education facilities, and healthcare facilities with an overnight stay facility</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Leanne Roberts	257.2	Amend	Seeks a new definition for artificial crop protection structures and provision in the roles for such structures. States they are distinctly different to crop protection devices which are focused on noise.	Seeks to include a definition for artificial crop protection structures: <u>Means structures with permeable material used to protect crops and/ or enhance growth (excluding greenhouses). Artificial crop protection structures are not buildings.</u>	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /CROP PROTECTION DEVICES	Leanne Roberts	257.3	Amend	Considers the definition of crop protection devices and related rules appears to include devices that emit noise, as opposed to other types of devices. States it should be clear that the intent of the definition is limited to noise emitting devices. The relevant terms used in the rules are audible bird scaring device, hail cannon and frost protection fans. These terms should be defined so they inform the specific rules.	Seeks to delete the definition of crop protection devices and include definitions for: <u>Audible bird scaring device</u> <u>means gas guns and audible avian distress devices used for the purpose of disturbing or scaring birds. It excludes firearms and vehicles used for that purpose.</u> <u>Frost protection fans</u> <u>means fixed devices used to move air to protect a crop from frost damage.</u> <u>Hail cannons</u> <u>are devices generating shock waves to disrupt the formation of hailstones in the atmosphere.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Leanne Roberts	257.4	Amend	Seeks a definition for greenhouse and specific provisions in the rules for such structures.	Seeks to include a definition for greenhouse: <u>Means a structure enclosed by impermeable material used for the cultivation or protection of plants in a controlled environment</u>  <u>but excludes artificial crop protection structures.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Leanne Roberts	257.5	Amend	Submitter supports the inclusion for highly productive land. However, states definition will only apply once highly productive land has been mapped and included in the Hawkes Bay Regional Policy Statement. There needs to be an interim definition until such mapping and plan changes have occurred based on clause 3.5 (7) of the NPSHPL.	Seeks to amend the definition of highly productive land as follows: <u>Until such time as mapping of highly productive land has been undertaken highly productive land is as defined in Clause 3.5 (7) of the NPSHPL being land that is zoned general rural or rural production land that is LUC1,2, or 3 land but is not identified for future urban development or subject to a Council initiated or adopted notified plan change to rezone it from general rural or rural production to urban or rural lifestyle.</u> <u>For the purposes of this plan in the interim highly productive land will include versatile land as defined in the Regional Policy Statement 2010.</u> Alternatively seeks to add definition for productive soils which are highly productive land and versatile soils.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / NOISE SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Leanne Roberts	257.6	Amend	Supports inclusion of a definition for noise sensitive activity but seeks that there is clarity in the definition. The proposed definition uses travellers' accommodation but the defined term in the Plan is visitor accommodation. Places of assembly are not defined in the Plan nor in the National Planning Standards. It is unclear how rules for noise sensitive activities would apply to such areas which are not defined. There is also a definition for 'activities sensitive to noise'. It would appear that they seek to address the same issues and the terms should be amended to use one term consistently in the Plan.	Seeks to Amend the definition of noise sensitive activity, by deleting travellers' accommodation and replacing it with visitor accommodation, delete places of assembly, delete definition of either noise sensitive activity, or activities sensitive to noise.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / PRIMARY BUILDING AND/OR STRUCTURE	Leanne Roberts	257.7	Amend	Considers the definition of dwelling is not defined in the plan. Suggests the term residential activity should be used as this would be consistent with the definition for primary building and/or structure.	Seeks to amend the definition of primary building and/or structure by replacing dwelling with residential activity in a residential area or rural production zone.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY	Leanne Roberts	257.8	Amend	Amend the definition of primary building and/or structure by: Replace dwelling with residential activity in a residential area or rural production zone.	Seeks to delete 'land-based' form the definition of productive capacity.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Leanne Roberts	257.9	Amend	Considers, 'Places of assembly' are not defined in the Plan nor in the National Planning Standards. It is unclear how rules for sensitive activities would apply to such areas which are not defined.	Seeks to amend the definition of sensitive activities by deleting places of assembly.	Open Submission
Definitions /General /General	Leanne Roberts	257.10	Amend	Considers that the plan specifically provides for this activity, so a definition is warranted for plan interpretation. The proposed definitions are those included in the Hastings District Plan and Proposed Central Hawke's Bay District Plans.	Seeks to Amend to: <u>Seasonal worker accommodation means any premises used for accommodation purposes directly associated with the seasonal labour requirements of the Districts horticulture, viticulture, and cropping industries and includes both new and existing permanent buildings and relocatable structures</u> OR <u>Seasonal worker accommodation means any premises used for residential accommodation purposes directly associated with the seasonal labour requirements of the District's agriculture, horticulture, viticulture, and cropping industries, including both existing permanent buildings and new relocatable structures.</u> <u>Seasonal workers accommodation includes ancillary kitchen, dining and ablution facilities and other ancillary living and recreation facilities for the exclusive use of resident seasonal workers, whether in one building or multiple buildings.</u>	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions / SUPPORTING ACTIVITIES	Leanne Roberts	257.11	Amend	The definition of supporting activities relates only to highly productive land. Therefore the definition should only relate to highly productive land. At present it could imply that the definition could apply to any land, not just highly productive land.	Seeks to amend the title to the definition for supporting activities: Supporting activities (highly productive land)	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / VERSATILE LAND	Leanne Roberts	257.12	Amend	Considers that the term versatile land will become redundant once the mapping of highly productive land is included in the regional policy statement. The land included as versatile land includes more than that the interim definition for highly productive land but may be included in the mapping of highly productive land. Until that time there is a need to provide for versatile land as in the Operative Regional Policy Statement in the interim.	Seeks to include versatile land as defined in the Regional Policy Statement 2010 as highly productive land in the interim definition of highly productive land to apply until such time as mapping of highly productive land has been undertaken and included in the Regional Policy Statement.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY	Leanne Roberts	257.13	Amend	Considers addressing productive land in the Plan is complex as the versatile land provisions of the RPS apply and the NPSHPL highly productive land. In a number of places, the Plan (eg SD-UFD-16) refers to 'productive soils'. It would be appropriate to define both highly productive land and versatile soils and then include them in an umbrella definition for productive soils.	Seeks to include a definition for productive soils: <u>Are highly productive land and versatile land as defined in this Plan.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Leanne Roberts	257.14	Amend	Considers there needs to be adequate provision for ancillary rural earthworks to enable small scale earthworks to be undertaken as a permitted activity. This is particularly important in response to natural hazard events. Cultivation is not included in the definition as it is a separate activity and not part of earthworks activities.	Seeks to Add Provision for ancillary rural earthworks: <u>Ancillary rural earthworks, means:</u> a) <u>Normal agricultural and horticultural practices, such as ploughing, planting trees, root ripping, digging post holes, maintenance of drains, troughs and installation of their associated pipe networks, and realignment of fencelines, drilling bores and offal pits, burying of dead stock and plant waste;</u> b) <u>Land preparation and vegetation clearance undertaken as part of horticultural plantings; and Maintenance of existing walking tracks, farm and forestry tracks, driveways, roads and accessways within the same formation width.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Phil Stickney	263.1	Amend	Insert a new definition for habitable room to clarify and aid in useability of the MRZ, MUZ and HRZ and to align with the relief sought in respect of Rule MRZ-S12, MHALP. The definition set out in Part 14 of the National Planning Standards is sought to be included within The Plan.	Seeks the definition set out in Part 14 to be included within The Plan.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Phil Stickney	263.2	Amend	Amend definition of 'Retail Activity' as it is too broad and enables a significant range of activities to establish. Refinement will provide more certainty and enable tailored management within the zone. A definition that enables trade supply activities as a clearly defined activity within the LFRZ and GIZ and LIZ is sought to enable operations to span across trade supplies and customer supplies.	Include a definition of trade supply which captures sales also to the general public of: a) Automotive or marine supplies; b) Building supplies; c) Catering equipment; d) Farming and agricultural supplies; e) Garden and outdoor equipment; f) Industrial supplies; g) Landscape supplies; h) Outdoor recreation equipment; i) Pet supplies; and j) Maintenance and cleaning supplies.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND	Nichola Nicholson	264.1	Amend	Amend the definition of Highly Productive Land. The PDP's Glossary only replicates part of the meaning of 'highly productive land' as defined in the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. HBRC has a programme of work underway to prepare maps of highly productive land in the region and publicly notify those maps for inclusion in the Regional Policy Statement by October 2025 (as directed to do so by the NPSHPL). In the meantime, the NPSHPL features provisions for councils' making decisions on proposed plans and consent applications before those maps of highly productive land are operative in the RPS.	Amend definition of 'highly productive land' to repeat in full the same definition as given in the NPSHPL (i.e., by adding the words "... (but see Clause 3.5(7) for what is treated as highly productive land before the maps as included in an operative regional policy statement and clause 3.5(6) for when land is rezoned and therefore ceases to be highly productive land)."	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / VERSATILE LAND	Nichola Nicholson	264.11	Amend	Some terms are used interchangeably and inconsistently in the PDP. For example, Issue RLZ-11 refers to loss of "highly productive land and versatile soil" whereas Definitions feature the term 'versatile land.' Another example of inconsistent terminology is Policy RLZ-P4a which refers to "productive capacity of highly productive land and soils" but not 'versatile' soils here. These are a few examples to illustrate our point, but these may not be the only instances throughout the PDP of such inconsistencies.	Amend PDP as necessary to remove ambiguity, confusion and increase consistent use of terms when referencing land/soil of high productive value.	Open Submission



# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /General /General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere	273.2	Amend	Considers the Definition of 'Archaeological Site' should usefully be defined in the Definitions Section as it is used in a number of places in the Plan, and for the avoidance of doubt, it would be beneficial for the term to be defined.	Amend the Interpretation / Definitions Section as follows: <u>Archaeological site -</u> <u>has the same meaning as given in the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (as set out below):means, subject to section 42(3) of the HNZPT Act,-</u> <u>a. any place in New Zealand, including any building or structure (or part of a building or structure), that -</u> <u>i. was associated with human activity that occurred before 1900</u> or is the site of the wreck of any vessel where the wreck occurred  <u>before 1900; and</u> <u>ii. provides or may provide, through investigation by archaeological methods, evidence relating to the history of New Zealand; and</u> <u>b. includes a site for which a declaration is made under section 43(1) of the HNZPT Act.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /ALTERATION OR ADDITION	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere	273.3	Amend	Considers the Definition of 'Alteration or Addition' should be amended as a very broad definition for alteration is proposed, which potentially extends far beyond the common word usage of the word 'alteration'.The terms alteration and addition should be separated. Under the proposed provisions, the demolition of a front façade of a scheduled heritage building, could be treated as an alteration. In the current definition, demolition up to 30% of a building, is covered by the term 'alteration'. It has no regard to how significant this portion of a building is, or whether previous parts of a building have been demolished or substantially altered. Provisions which potentially disguise a significant volume of 'partial demolition' under a more oblique term, could potentially encourage demolition in stages.	Amend 'Alteration or Addition' Definition as follows: <del>Alteration and Addition: Means any change to, addition to, or removal of up to 30% of the total floor area or volume (whichever is the lesser), of any scheduled historic heritage item or building or structure within an historic heritage overlay or precinct. It does not include repair and/or maintenance, or safety alteration works, which have a separate meaning in this Plan</del> <u>Alteration</u> <u>means modifications to a building or object that do not have the effect of increasing the gross floor area, footprint, mass or height of the building or object.</u> <u>Addition:</u> <u>means modifications to a building or object that have the effect of increasing the gross floor area, footprint, mass or height of the building or object and includes the creation of new floor levels.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / CONSERVATION PLAN	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere	273.4	Support	Supports the Definition of 'Conservation Plan' suggested by HNZPT as part of their submission to the Draft Plan that has now been accepted in the PDP.	Retain the Definition of 'Conservation Plan' as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / CONTRIBUTORY SITES	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere	273.5	Support	Supports the Definition of 'Contributory Sites' as the definition clarifies the meaning of the term Contributory Sites.	Retain the Definition of 'Contributory Sites' in its entirety.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / HISTORIC HERITAGE	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere	273.6	Support	Supports the Definition of 'Historic Heritage' as HNZPT is supportive of a definition of Historic Heritage that cross-references the definition found in the RMA.	Retain the Definition of 'Historic Heritage'.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / MAINTENANCE (HERITAGE)	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere	273.7	Support	The submitter supports the Definition of 'Maintenance (Heritage)'.	Retain the Definition of 'Maintenance (Heritage)' as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / NON-CONTRIBUTORY SITE	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere	273.8	Support	Supports the Definition of 'Non-Contributory Site' as the term is useful for interpreting provisions applying to Heritage Overlay areas.	Retain the Definition of 'Non-Contributory Site' in the PDP.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / PARTIAL DEMOLITION	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere	273.9	Oppose	Opposes the Definition of 'Partial Demolition' as concern is raised that partial demolition does not cover demolition of less than 30% of building. See comments under the submission point on the definition of 'Alteration and Addition'. Suggested definition is taken from Wellington City Council Proposed Plan.	Amend the 'Partial Demolition' Definition as follows: <u>means alterations to demolish, destroy or remove part of any building or structure.</u> <del>the removal or demolition of between 30% and 80% of the total floor area or volume (whichever is the lesser) of a building or structure.</del>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / REPAIR (HERITAGE)	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere	273.10	Amend	HNZPT considers that an amendment is required to the 'Repair (Heritage)' Definition solely because there is a spelling mistake.	Amend 'Repair (Heritage)' Definition as follows: "means.... <del>material material</del> "	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / SAFETY ALTERATIONS (HERITAGE)	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere	273.11	Support	Supports the Definition of 'Safety Alterations (Heritage)' for improving structural performance, fire safety or physical access.	Retain the Definition of 'Safety Alterations (Heritage)' as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / SEISMIC STRENGTHENING	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere	273.12	Support	Supports the Definition of 'Seismic Strengthening' to make buildings or structures more resistant to seismic activity.	Retain the Definition of 'Seismic Strengthening'.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / TOTAL DEMOLITION	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere	273.13	Oppose	Opposes the Definition of 'Total Demolition' in accordance with the HNZPT submission points made on 'Partial Demolition' and Definition of 'Alteration or Addition'.	Amend the Definition of 'Total Demolition' as follows: Total Demolition means <u>the removal or demolition of more than 80% of the total floor area or volume (whichever is the lesser) of a building or structure. to completely destroy or demolish.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / WĀHI TAPU	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere	273.14	Support	Supports the Definition of 'Wāhi Tapu'.	Retain the Definition of 'Wāhi Tapu' as notified.	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions /General	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kota	277.1	Amend	Seeks the inclusion of a definition of High Land Transport Noise Control Overlay for clarity. This submission point aligns with other NZTA submission points on the Noise Chapter and Planning Maps seeking the inclusion of provisions and amendment to the High Land Transport Noise mapped overlay extent.	Add new definition as follows: <u>High Land Transport Noise Control Overlay</u> means the area potentially affected by noise between a railway corridor boundary or State Highway boundary and a distance of 100m. High Land Transport Noise Control Overlay shown on the planning maps identifies areas that have the potential to experience high noise levels from rail and road traffic. New buildings and alterations to habitable rooms in buildings used for sensitive land uses are required to demonstrate that adverse noise effects have been appropriately managed by demonstrating compliance with the standards specified in the Noise Chapter.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kota	277.2	Amend	Seeks the inclusion of a definition of Transport Network. Supports the inclusion of this definition as transport network is a term is used throughout the Plan and for clarity, and seeks a definition which includes the state highway network.	Add new definition as follows: <u>Transport Network</u> means Transport networks and operations in Napier City of national or regional significance including: <u>State highways;</u> <u>Arterial roads;</u> <u>Rail networks and systems; and</u> <u>The region's core public passenger transport operations.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / CLEANFILL MATERIAL	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kota	277.3	Support	Supports as Council has amended definition to be consistent with the National Planning Standards definition.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / EDUCATIONAL FACILITY	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kota	277.4	Support	Supports as council has amended definition to be consistent with the National Planning Standards definition.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / HABITABLE ROOM	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kota	277.5	Support	Supports the definition of 'habitable room' within the Draft Plan. Acknowledges this definition is taken from the national planning standards.	Retain the national planning standard definition of Habitable Room as drafted.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / HEIGHT IN RELATION TO BOUNDARY	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kota	277.6	Support	Supports the inclusion of a definition for height in relation to boundary.	Retain as notified	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / INFRASTRUCTURE	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kota	277.7	Support	Supports the definition of Infrastructure within the Draft Plan, as it is consistent with Part 2 of the Resource Management Act 1991	Retain as notified	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / SIGN	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kota	277.8	Support	Supports as Council has amended definition to be consistent with the National Planning Standards definition.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / PAKAKAINGA	Development Nous Limited - Ph	280.1	Amend	To clarify and aid in useability of the PAK provisions, the definition of Papakāinga in the Definitions section of the Plan should be refined and expanded upon. The importance of the Papakāinga definition is the linkage to be established between the activity and the relationship of Mana whenua to the land as well as capturing the fact that other activities are often an integral component of such communities.	Seeks to Amend the current definition in the Plan to read: PAKAKAINGA HOUSING means a comprehensive residential development for tangata whenua residing in Napier City to provide residential accommodation for members of iwi or hapū groups on Māori land and/ or land which Mana Whenua have a connection to and/or within the Māori Purpose zone, and also includes communal buildings, facilities and commercial activities to support the papakāinga and community.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / MĀORI PURPOSE ACTIVITIES	Development Nous Limited - Ph	280.2	Amend	The Submitter seeks a wider and more inclusive definition of Māori Purpose Activities to that currently set out in the Plan. The current definition centres largely on festivals, events (temporary), traditional cultural practices and ancillary structures to support such activities. MAT submit that this is a somewhat narrow view of Māori Purpose Activities, noting that there is already a definition for Māori Cultural Activity in the Plan. It is further noted that there is also a definition of Māori Cultural Tourism Activities in the Plan. It is considered that a merging and restructuring of such definitions is required in order to capture the relief sought by the Submitter on this issue and result in a more cohesive suite of definitions.	Add a new definition and/or restructure the existing relevant definitions within the Plan to ensure that the following matters are captured and can be utilised for the respective zones over which they are intended to apply: <u>MĀORI PURPOSE ACTIVITIES</u> means the use of land and/or buildings for a range of activities for  <u>Māori cultural, community and living purposes, and/or integrated Māori development, including but not limited to one or more of the following activities:</u> a) <u>marae/pā;</u> b) <u>papakāinga;</u> c) <u>urupā;</u> d) <u>wānanga;</u> e) <u>customary activities;</u> f) <u>home occupation;</u> g) <u>arts and cultural centres;</u> h) <u>cultural education and research facilities;</u> i) <u>Māori cultural activities;</u> j) <u>child care services, kohanga reo or kura (schools); and</u> k) <u>whare karakia (Māori church)</u> l) <u>commercial activities to support the papakainga and community</u>	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions / AIRCRAFT OPERATION	Alec Duncan	288.1	Support	Fire and Emergency supports the definition for 'Aircraft Operation' to the extent that it excludes aircraft operations associated with emergencies including aircraft undertaking firefighting or search and rescue duties. This supports Fire and Emergency's operational functions.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / AIRPORT ACTIVITY	Alec Duncan	288.2	Support	Fire and Emergency supports the definition for 'Airport Activity' to the extent that it includes activities associated with rescue and fire facilities which are an important component of airport operations.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / COMMUNITY FACILITY	Alec Duncan	288.3	Amend	Given there is no definition for emergency service facility, as proposed, the definition for community facility would likely include emergency service facilities due to reference to land and buildings for safety and health purposes. Fire and Emergency does not consider this appropriate. While emergency service facilities such as fire stations are important to enable Fire and Emergency to serve communities, the facilities themselves are not community facilities in the same way that churches and community halls are. They are not for the use of the general public and have very specific operational and functional requirements. For this reason, Fire and Emergency would like emergency service facilities to be provided with a new definition for 'emergency service facility' and that this be provided for in each zone as a permitted activity.	Seeks to amend to add a new definition of emergency service facility as they are not for the use of general public.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Alec Duncan	288.4	Amend	Fire and Emergency seeks the inclusion of a new definition for 'Emergency Service Facility' to differentiate the role and function of emergency service facilities from other community facilities and that this be provided for in each zone as a permitted activity and be reflected in the objective and policy framework of the PDP. This acknowledges the important role and function of these facilities in the community.	Seeks New definition: <u>Emergency service facility – means the facilities of organisations that are responsible for the safety and physical welfare of people or property in the community. It includes fire stations, ambulance stations, and emergency coordination facilities.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / FUNCTIONAL NEED	Alec Duncan	288.5	Support	Fire and Emergency supports the definition of 'functional need' as it acknowledges that that there is a need for some proposals or activities to traverse, locate or operate in a particular environment because the activity can only occur in that environment.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE	Alec Duncan	288.6	Support	Fire and Emergency supports the definition of 'Hazardous Substance' being consistent with Section 2 of the RMA and reference to other relevant legislation being the 'Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996' and the 'Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996'.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / NAUTRAL HAZARD	Alec Duncan	288.7	Support	Fire and Emergency supports the definition of 'natural hazard' being consisted with Section 2 of the RMA.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / OPERATIONAL NEED	Alec Duncan	288.8	Support	Fire and Emergency supports the definition of 'Operational Need' as recognises activities can have a need to operate in certain locations because of technical, logistical or operational characteristics or constraints. Fire stations that have a need to operate in certain areas may including residential environments and areas at risk of natural hazards. Allowing fire stations to operate where there is an operational need can help reduce response times to fire events and protect the community more efficiently.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	Alec Duncan	288.9	Amend	Subject to the acceptance of the amendments sought to the definition of 'community facility' and 'emergency service facility', Fire and Emergency supports the definition for the reasons set out above	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions / SIGNIFICANT HAZARDOUS FACILITIES	Alec Duncan	288.10	Amend	Fire and Emergency supports the definition of 'Significant Hazardous Facilities' in part, to the extent that it seeks to define, and subsequently manage, the effects of significant hazardous facilities on other land uses. However, Fire and Emergency note the following:1. The storage and/or treatment of hazardous waste (including reuse and recycling facilities) or hazardous substances awaiting reuse, recycling or treatment should be included as a 'Significant Hazardous Facility'. This would provide NCC the ability to manage facilities that become high risk as a result of stockpiling materials. Where the economics of the business changes and they cannot process or dispose of materials, this can become a high fire risk and poses a risk to the health and safety of communities.Fire and Emergency requests that 'the storage and/or treatment of hazardous waste (including reuse and recycling facilities) or hazardous substances awaiting reuse, recycling or treatment' should be listed as a significant hazardous facility.2. Emergency service facilities and associated firefighting activities involve the use and storage of hazardous substances at quantities that are considered minor. Fire and Emergency's firefighting chemicals do not have the types of hazard classifications that are covered by the WorkSafe Major Hazardous Facilities regulations, so Fire and Emergency sites would never be a Major Hazardous Facilities because of them. The only substances that Fire and Emergency have that trigger this is oxygen for medical purposes, and Fire and Emergency facilities would never come close to 200 tonne limit for a lower tier Major Hazardous Facilities.However, there are circumstances where Fire and Emergency needs to temporarily store large quantities of product in an emergency. Based on this definition, it is possible that PDP may not enable for this and could affect Fire and Emergency's ability to operate as effectively as needed.In a major event, Fire and Emergency would try to	Amend as follows: Significant hazardous facilities Means any facility which involves one or more of the following activities: <u>the storage and/or treatment of hazardous waste (including reuse and recycling facilities) or hazardous substances awaiting reuse, recycling, or treatment.</u> The following activities are not considered to be significant hazardous facilities: <u>the incidental use and storage (including for disposal) of hazardous substances for emergency service activities.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions /General	Alec Duncan	288.11	Amend	Fire and Emergency seeks the inclusion of a new definition for 'temporary emergency services training activity' in order to provide greater clarity to plan users and to support the relief sought elsewhere in this submission.	Add a new definition: <u>Temporary emergency services training activity</u> <u>Means a temporary activity undertaken for the training of any component of Fire and Emergency New Zealand for any emergency purpose.</u> <u>An emergency purpose are those purposes which enable Fire and Emergency New Zealand to achieve its main functions under sections 11 and 12 of the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017.</u>	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.4	Support	The impact of climate change is a significant issue, including for Napier which was affected by Cyclone Gabrielle. Large volumes of sediment and vegetation came down with the flood waters to the north of Napier with catastrophic effects and to the west of Napier.	Supports the definition of "Green Infrastructure" contained in the proposed plan, and submits that this concept should be applied throughout the plan where it would potentially contribute to addressing the critical issue of climate change, for example in relation to stormwater attenuation and treatment.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / MINOR UPGRADING OF NETWORK UTILITIES	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.10	Support	Supports the definition of 'Minor upgrading of network utility' as it is helpful to clarify interpretation of "minor upgrading" for network utilities. This in turn provides some certainty of potential scale for adverse effects associate with minor upgrades. However, relying on this definition alone may not be appropriate where activities to undertake upgrading would have adverse effects beyond the footprint of the network utility.	Seeks to retain the definition as proposed.Consider the need for standards and conditions in rules to manage adverse effects.	Open Submission
Definitions /Definitions / CONSERVATION PLAN	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.11	Amend	Considers that the definition is only used in relation to the HH chapter and should be limited to Historic Heritage.	Seeks to amend as follows <u>In relation to Historic Heritage</u> ,means a document that sets out what is significant about a site and what policies are appropriate to enable that significance to be retained in the site's future use and development.	Open Submission

# Definitions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Definitions /Definitions / SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREA	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.12	Amend	Considers that the definition does not provide for areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna that are not yet identified in the district plan, for example an area discovered as part of a consenting process. While the SNA provisions in the NPSIB only apply to areas identified in plans, the Council still has responsibilities under s6(c) to recognise and provide for the protection of all significant areas, not only those that are identified in the Plan.	Amend as follows: Includes: a) <del>areas meeting the definition has the same meaning as in the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity 2023 (NPSIB) and means:</del> i) any area that, after the commencement date [of the NPSIB], is notified or included in a district plan as a Significant Natural Area (SNA) following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 1 of the NPSIB; and ii) any area that, on the commencement date [of the NPSIB], is already identified in a policy statement or plan as an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna (regardless of how it is described); in which case it remains as an SNA unless or until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by the relevant local authority determines that it is not an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna; and b) <u>areas that have not been identified in the Plan, but that meet the criteria in Appendix 1 of the NPSIB.</u>	Open Submission

# Abbreviations

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Abbreviations /Abbreviations /	Tom Anderson	151.13	Support	The abbreviation NESTF is appropriate and necessary	Retain the NESTF abbreviation as notified.	<a href="#">Open Submission</a>
Abbreviations /Abbreviations /	Ellen Robotham	198.13	Amend	Considers the abbreviation is correct, however the explanation that follows is not.	Delete the words "produced annually by CIAL based on the previous year's aircraft operations."	<a href="#">Open Submission</a>
Abbreviations /Abbreviations /	Ellen Robotham	198.14	Amend	Considers the abbreviation is correct, however there is a small spelling error.	Hawke's should have an apostrophe.	<a href="#">Open Submission</a>
Abbreviations /Abbreviations /	Ellen Robotham	198.15	Support	The abbreviation is correct.	Retain as notified.	<a href="#">Open Submission</a>
Abbreviations /Abbreviations /	Ellen Robotham	198.16	Support	The abbreviation is correct.	Retain as notified.	<a href="#">Open Submission</a>

# National Policy Statements and NZCPS

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
National policy statements and NZCPS /National Policy Statements and NZ Coastal Policy Statement /	Sera Chambers	150.91	Oppose	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	Open Submission
National policy statements and NZCPS /National Policy Statements and NZ Coastal Policy Statement /General	Trevor Ellis	253.1	Amend	It has been noted that the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter has been delayed in order to give effect to the gazetted version of the NPS-IB 2023. While the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter will contain the bulk of the implementation of the NPS-IB, there are other chapters in the proposed plan that need to give effect to it.	seeks to amend to implement the NPS-IB into the Plan where required.	Open Submission
National policy statements and NZCPS /National Policy Statements and NZ Coastal Policy Statement /	Trevor Ellis	253.3	Amend	The Proposed Plan has not been updated sufficiently to give effect to the NZCPS 2010. The language used in the Plan reflects the language of the Hawke's Bay Regional Coastal Plan, which was notified in 2008, meaning the Regional Coastal Plan uses the terminology of the NZCPS 1994. Terminology should be updated to reflect the current NZCPS 2010.	seeks that the plan be reviewed and updated to implement the NZCPS 2010.	Open Submission

# National Environmental Standards

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
National environmental standards /National Environmental Standards /	Tom Anderson	151.14	Support	Supports the cross reference to the NESTF	Retain this section as notified.	Open Submission



# TW - Tangata Whenua - Mana Whenua

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TW - Tangata whenua - Mana whenua /Mana Whenua Authorities and Representation /	Wayne Ormsby	63.2	Support	Supports the section of the Tangata Whenua - Mana Whenua chapter relating to representation. Considers the Taiwhenua of Te Whanganui-a- Orotū to have a good working relationship with Mana Ahuriri Trust in matters relating to estuary management. reminds Council of their obligations under the settlement for the statutory acknowledgement area of the Ahuriri Estuary.	Support statement relating to representation within Mana Whenua - Tangata Whenua chapter (inferred decision requested).	Open Submission
TW - Tangata whenua - Mana whenua /Ko nga ture a te kawanatanga Statutory Context /	Sera Chambers	150.92	Oppose	opposes on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue to enjoy their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development may impact on their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	seeks that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue to enjoy their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development may impact on their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
TW - Tangata whenua - Mana whenua / /	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.74	Amend	This section is missing reference to the relevant iwi and hapū management plans that apply within the Napier City boundaries. The objectives and policies of the plan give effect to them however they are not specifically identified. This should be included to assist plan users in understanding the full planning context.	Add reference and brief description of the following: - Kahungunu ki Uta, Kahungunu ki Tai, Marine and Freshwater Fisheries Strategic Plan (KKUKKT) - Tutaekuri Awa Management and Enhancement Plan Te Taiwhenua o Heretaunga – Mana Ake (Hapū Management Plan)	Open Submission
TW - Tangata whenua - Mana whenua /TW - Tangata Whenua - Mana Whenua /General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere	273.15	Support	Supports the TW - Tangata whenua - Mana whenua Section about the Heritage New Zealand / Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 subject to any consequential amendments requested by Mana whenua.	Retain the TW - Tangata whenua - Mana whenua Section about the Heritage New Zealand / Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 subject to any Mana whenua suggested amendments.	Open Submission
TW - Tangata whenua - Mana whenua /Ko nga ture a te kawanatanga Statutory Context /	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere	273.16	Amend	Considers amending the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 Section in Ko nga ture a te kawanatanga Statutory Context for consistency purposes.	Amend the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 Section in Ko nga ture a te kawanatanga Statutory Context as follows: ... <del>Any interference with an archaeological site is a punishable offence.</del> <u>It is an offence under the HNZPTA to modify or destroy an archaeological site without an archaeological authority.</u>	Open Submission

## SD - Historic and Cultural Heritage

Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Phillip Boyle	32.1	Oppose	Considers that the rezoning streets to a zone that allows for a greater level of development eg buildings up to 6 storeys in height, will have an impact on the character of those streets identified for their heritage values. Concerned about the impact on character and shading issues. Seeks higher buildings yo only be located within areas where they don't impact other houses. The District Plan needs to include provisions that require off-street car parking. If the changes requested aren't accepted, then it is requested that the Napier South Historic Heritage Area is removed from the District Plan.	Seeks to delete provisions that would allow up to 6 stories high in the area surrounding McDonald Street; and the inclusion of off-street carparking requirements. If these changes aren't accepted, then the submitter seeks the removal of the Napier South Historic Heritage Area.	Open Submission
Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.14	Amend	Powerco notes that this objective will need to be assessed for any application for resource consent that is discretionary or non-complying. We are concerned that the inclusion of 'protection' in this objective would likely be used as grounds to decline an application for resource consent.	Amend as follows:  SD-HH-O1: Character, culture, heritage, and landscapes  Napier's distinctive character, culture, heritage, and landscapes are recognised, celebrated, maintained, <del>protected</del> , and enhanced.	Open Submission
Sue Myles	208.1	Support	Concerns the poorly designed signage on heritage buildings in the CBD and the painting of buildings in inappropriate colours on heritage buildings in the CBD. Seeks to remove snadwich board from the CBD and remove street lighting where it is attached to buildings in the CBD.	Support provisions that seek to manage signage with regards to font size, sign size, colours, signage on windows, sandwich boards. Consider providing street lighting in an alternative manner to being attached to buildings.	Open Submission
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.17	Support	The submitter supports SD - Strategic Direction Historic and Cultural Heritage Introduction as appropriate.	Retain SD - Strategic Direction Historic and Cultural Heritage Introduction as notified.	Open Submission

# SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /General	Tony Michelle	73.5	Amend	The plan should recognise that to sustain Primary production for the economic and social wellbeing of the region the rural character must be maintained.	Insert new Strategic Objective:  Character of the rural environment: The character of the rural environment is maintained and enhanced.	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /General	Tony Michelle	73.6	Amend	Primary production is important to the economic and social wellbeing of the region therefore should be recognised in the plan.	Insert new Strategic Objective:  Social and economic wellbeing: Napier's rural environment contributes positively to the district's economic and social wellbeing.	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /General	Tony Michelle	73.7	Amend	The plan should recognise that primary production is important to the economic and social wellbeing of the region therefore productive capacity should be protected.	Insert new Strategic Objective: Productive capacity - The General Rural Zone remains available for primary production activities and productive capacity is protected.	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /SD-SRCC-06: Climate change adaptation	Rebecca Eng	99.26	Amend	Amendment is sought to the objective to provide recognition of those activities which assist in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Such recognition would give effect to Policy 1 of the NPSET, give effect to the National Adaptation Plan 2022, and the consultation drafts of the NPS-REG and NPS-ET in terms of recognising the benefits of avoiding, reducing, and displacing greenhouse gas emissions to help mitigate change. While the consultation documents are draft only, they provide a clear indication of future policy direction.	Amend as follows: SD-SRCC-06: Climate change adaptation Land use, subdivision, and development design supports climate change adaptation, <u>and recognise and provide for those activities which assist in reducing greenhouse gas emissions.</u>	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /General	Jimmy Guerin	134.5	Amend	Considers that the Plan should recognise the maintenance of rural character for its contribution to the sustainability of Primary Production and impact upon the economic and social well-being of the region.	Insert a new Strategic Direction Objective: <u>Character of the rural environment.</u> <u>The character of the rural environment is maintained and enhanced.</u>	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /General	Jimmy Guerin	134.6	Amend	Primary production is important to the economic and social wellbeing of the region and therefore should be recognised in the plan.	Insert new Strategic Direction Objective: <u>Social and economic wellbeing:</u> <u>Napier's rural environment contributes positively to the district's economic and social wellbeing.</u>	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /General	Jimmy Guerin	134.7	Amend	Primary production is important to the economic and social wellbeing of the region and therefore it should be recognised and protected in the plan.	Insert a new Strategic Direction Objective: <u>Productive capacity - The General Rural Zone remains available for primary production activities and productive capacity is protected.</u>	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Issues /SD-SRCC-11: Natural hazard resilience	Sera Chambers	150.93	Amend	considers that this information appears to support future greenfield development in the hills of Napier rather than intensification in low-lying areas of Napier, including Onekawa and Pirimai. It would be prudent of NCC to make any decisions on the medium-density residential zone without taking this current information into account.	seeks to amend to ensure that decisions on the medium-density residential zone do not take this current information into account.	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Issues /Indigenous biodiversity across the city is generally declining.	Sera Chambers	150.94	Support	supports that council has responsibility to recognise and provide for the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna from adverse effects of land use and development as a matter of national important. Considers that this should be a consideration around whether medium-density is appropriate for Onekawa and Pirimai when the Onekawa North Plantation Reserve, home to native birds and eels, is in close proximity.	seeks that this issue be part of the consideration around whether medium-density is appropriate for Onekawa and Pirimai.	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /Risk and vulnerability of people and property from natural hazards is minimised.	Sera Chambers	150.95	Amend	considers that this information appears to support future greenfield development in the hills of Napier rather than intensification in low-lying areas of Napier, including Onekawa and Pirimai. It would be prudent of NCC to make any decisions on the medium-density residential zone without taking this current information into account.	seeks to amend to ensure that decisions on the medium-density residential zone do not take this current information into account.	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /There is no significant increase in the risk from natural hazards, including the effects of climate change, to people, property, and infrastructure as a result of subdivision, use, and development.	Sera Chambers	150.96	Amend	considers that the current strategic direction does not take into account provisions on natural hazards. Hawke's Bay Regional Council has recently provided updated information which appears to support future greenfield development in the hills of Napier rather than intensification in low-lying areas of Napier, including Onekawa and Pirimai. It would be prudent of NCC to make any decisions on the medium-density residential zone without taking this current information into account.	seeks to amend to ensure that decisions on the medium-density residential zone do not take this current information from HBRC into account.	Open Submission

# SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /Significant indigenous vegetation, significant habitats of indigenous fauna, biodiversity, and waterways are maintained and enhanced.	Sera Chambers	150.97	Amend	supports that Council has responsibility to recognise and provide for the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna from adverse effects of land use and development as a matter of national importance. Considers that this should be a consideration around whether medium-density is appropriate for Onekawa and Pirimai when the Onekawa North Plantation Reserve, home to native birds and eels, is in close proximity.	seeks that this issue be part of the consideration around whether medium-density is appropriate for Onekawa and Pirimai.	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /Land use, subdivision, and development design supports climate change adaptation.	Sera Chambers	150.98	Amend	considers that the current strategic direction does not take into account provisions on natural hazards. Hawke's Bay Regional Council has recently provided updated information which appears to support future greenfield development in the hills of Napier rather than intensification in low-lying areas of Napier, including Onekawa and Pirimai. It would be prudent of NCC to make any decisions on the medium-density residential zone without taking this current information into account.	seeks to amend to ensure that decisions on the medium-density residential zone do not take this current information from HBRC into account.	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /SD-SRCC-O2: Resilient Napier	Sheena McGuire	168.21	Support	Generally supports the proposed objective which aims to protect infrastructure from significant increase in the risk from natural hazards, including climate change.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /SD - Strategic Direction /	Dominic Adams	221.4	Amend	Primary production is important to the economic and social wellbeing of the region therefore should be included in the plan via a specific strategic objective.	Seeks to Insert new Strategic Objective: <u>The rural zone and primary production is maintained and enhanced within the region to support social and economic wellbeing.</u>	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /SD-SRCC-O3: Natural systems	Trevor Ellis	253.27	Amend	"Natural systems" is a term that only appears in Objective 3 and nowhere else in the Plan.Considers that either a definition should be included to specify what a natural system is, or the term should be swapped out for a defined term. Otherwise retain objective as notified.	seeks to include a definition for 'natural systems' or replace it with a term that is defined in the plan.	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /SD-SRCC-O4: Ecology	Trevor Ellis	253.28	Support	The D-G supports Objective 4 as notified as it gives effect to the NZCPS, NPS-IB, and the RMA. considers that it is unclear what is meant by 'waterways' as it is undefined. To create clarity, change waterways to water as it is defined in the Act.	Retain, but amend to replace the term 'waterways' (which is no longer used under the RMA) with 'waters'	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /SD-SRCC-O5: Coastal environment	Trevor Ellis	253.29	Support	The D-G supports Objective 5 as notified as it gives effect to the NZCPS.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change	Robin Gwynn	262.3	Oppose	Notes concern about climate change among consumers, corporations, and residents, citing surveys and news reports. Notes the importance of addressing climate change as a major issue affecting every part of the city. Shares personal experience of encountering Cyclone Gabrielle and witnessing its impact, noting the urgency of the climate crisis. Considers that there is a lack of meaningful policies from political parties to counter the threat of climate change. Questions the actions and plans of the Napier City Council in response to climate change, regarding carbon emissions reduction, renewable energy adoption, waste management, and coordination with other organizations. Seeks transparency and accountability from the council regarding its efforts to address climate change and requests a statement on its progress in this regard. Refer to original submission for full reasons.	Seeks transparency and accountability from the council regarding its efforts to address climate change and requests a statement on its progress in this regard. Submitter provides a summary of the issues highlighted and considers that there has not been enough consultation and discussion before actions have been taken. Notes the priority of climate change matters, followed by the future of the Cathedral. Notes the roading and traffic issues discussed. Considers that these challenges need thought, prayer, joint action and new approaches. No provision-specific relief sought. Refer to original submission for full details.	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /SD-SRCC-O1: Risk and vulnerability	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.9	Amend	Supports the recognition of the risks posed by natural hazards but seek for the objective to be extended to the transport network. Notes that recent events have shown the vulnerability of the transport network to significant natural hazards. Considers minimising future adverse effects is vital for ensuring the functioning of the state highway network.	Amend as follows: Risk and vulnerability of people, property and <u>the transport network</u> is minimised.	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /SD-SRCC-O2: Resilient Napier	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.10	Amend	Notes that the objective seeks "no significant increase in the risk from natural hazards" to people property and infrastructure as a result of subdivision, use and development. Significant increase sets high threshold for what effects are appropriate. Amend to contain stronger directives to avoid adverse effects on property etc.	Amend as follows: <del>There is no significant</del> Any increase in the risk from natural hazards, including the effects of climate change, to people, property, and infrastructure as a result of subdivision, use, and development are <u>avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u>	Open Submission

# SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Issues /General	Vanessa Moon	282.4	Support	Support sustainability, resilience, and climate change initiatives outlined in PDP. Supports issues of water-sensitive design and low-impact stormwater management to protect water bodies, especially Te Whanganui-a-Orotu/Ahuriri Estuary. Supports enhancement of natural systems and features for climate change adaptation and hazard management. Supports protection and enhancement of Napier's declining biodiversity to support ecosystems, habitats, and provide opportunities for carbon storage to reduce our City's carbon emissions	<p>Submitter proposes the following options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Implementing a system of open stormwater ditches to increase stormwater holding capacity in Jervoistown, potentially planted with appropriate vegetation for water filtration.</li> <li>- Creating detention tanks with wetland plantings, possibly utilizing undeveloped sections like Napier Street.</li> <li>- Replacing asphalt roads with permeable surfaces and lowering speed limits to 40 kph within Jervoistown.</li> <li>- Encouraging property owners to install retention tanks, soak pits, replace hard surfaces with landscaped areas, and plant gardens with native and exotic plants for cooling, flood mitigation, and biodiversity.</li> <li>- Considering locations for community gardens and urban farms in Jervoistown.</li> <li>- Exploring alternative waste management methods, such as composting toilets, with a system for composting waste and utilizing resulting products for agricultural purposes.</li> </ul> <p>Notes their vision for Jervoistown: Foster community, biodiversity, climate-resilient water management, green Napier, and local food source. No specific relief sought. Refer to original submission for full details.</p>	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /SD-SRCC-O1: Risk and vulnerability	Alec Duncan	288.12	Support	<p>Fire and Emergency supports SD-SRCC-O1 insofar as it seeks to minimise risk and vulnerability of people and property from natural hazards.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency has additional functions under the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017 to respond to weather events, natural hazard events and disasters. Fire and Emergency's Risk Reduction Strategy 2019–2029 states that reducing risk is the single most effective mechanism to protect people, property and environment. As well as preventing incidents occurring in the first place, reducing the frequency of incidents, and mitigating the impacts of an emergency are also core risk reduction interventions. While Fire and Emergency's primary focus remains on the reduction of unwanted fire, Fire and Emergency as a primary responder during natural hazard events work across four areas of emergency management, through a model known as the 4Rs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reduction of risk</li> <li>• ensuring response readiness</li> <li>• providing emergency response</li> <li>• making coordinated efforts to facilitate recovery following an emergency.</li> </ul> <p>Fire and Emergency note that as defined, natural hazards include fire.</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /SD-SRCC-O2: Resilient Napier	Alec Duncan	288.13	Support	Fire and Emergency supports SD-SRCC-O2 as it requires no significant increase in the risk from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure as a result of subdivision, use and development. This aligns with Fire and Emergency's Statement of Intent to build resilient communities through reducing the risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

# SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /SD-SRCC-O6: Climate change adaptation	Alec Duncan	288.14	Support	Fire and Emergency supports SD-SRCC-O6 insofar as it requires land use, subdivision and development design which supports climate change adaptation. Among the many consequences of climate change such as more frequent severe weather events, wildfires are growing in intensity and spread in range across ecosystems. Climate change will increase the risk of wildfires starting and the way in which they behave. As such, Fire and Emergency is supportive of design measures that can reduce the impacts of climate change, particularly wildfire which can affect individuals, businesses and entire communities.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.14	Amend	Considers the grouping of these matters under the heading “Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change” does not adequately reflect the inclusion of strategic direction on the natural environment. “Sustainability” should not be limited to these objectives. All objectives should be achieving the purpose of the Act.	Consider deleting the term “sustainable” from the heading. Make a new heading “Natural Environment” and include strategic direction on indigenous biodiversity and coastal environment under that.	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Issues /SD-SRCC-I1: Natural hazard resilience	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.15	Support	Support as this is a reasonable description.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Issues /SD-SRCC-I2: Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (Ahuriri Estuary) and other water bodies	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.16	Amend	Considers that the explanation fails to explain the importance of addressing this issue in terms of the potential for collapse of biodiversity and ecological functions. As set out in the s32 report, in Napier most significant indigenous biodiversity is in and around Te Whanganui-a-Orotū. Currently only 5.94% of Napier’s land area is represented as Significant Natural Area, which is below the 10% level of indigenous habitat that is required in biodiversity depleted environments to avoid an accelerating rate of biodiversity loss and local extinctions.	Amend the explanation to address concerns raised and to capture the issues identified at 6.1.13 Biodiversity in the s32 report.	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Issues /SD-SRCC-I3: Biodiversity	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.17	Amend	Considers the explanation limits protection to being from adverse effects of land use and development. This does not reflect the wording of s6(c) which places a responsibility on the council to protect significant indigenous biodiversity, not limited to the management of adverse effects. The explanation focus is on significant indigenous biodiversity and does not explain that council has functions to maintain indigenous biodiversity more generally. The s32 report provides a better explanation of this issue. In particular that biodiversity levels are below the 10 percent needed to protect and maintain indigenous biodiversity in the district.	Seeks to amend the explanation to address Forest & Bird’s concerns and to capture the issues identified at 6.1.13 Biodiversity in the s32 report.	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /SD-SRCC-O1: Risk and vulnerability	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.18	Support	Support.	Retain.	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /SD-SRCC-O2: Resilient Napier	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.19	Amend	[List]	Reconsider this objective with the Natural Hazard provisions variation. Ensure that the scope of the future variation includes the SD objectives.	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /SD-SRCC-O3: Natural systems	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.20	Amend	It is not clear from the Objective wording that this relates to natural hazards or is intended to contribute to a reduction of stormwater runoff to receiving water bodies enabling the protection of significant habitat and the management of risks from natural hazards as a matter of natural importance (as set out in the s32 report). The term “natural systems” is not used in relevant higher order documents. More appropriate terminology would be to refer to “ecosystem health” and “ecosystem services and functions.” Amending this objective will also create better alignment with SW-O3: Receiving environment.	Amend: <u>Ecosystem health and ecosystem services and the functions of natural systems are protected in the management of stormwater and natural hazard risk from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.</u>	Open Submission

# SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /SD-SRCC-O4: Ecology	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.21	Amend	Concerned that capturing all these matters in one objective detracts from clearly setting out the outcome to be achieved. The objective fails to include restoration which is critical to the protection and maintenance of indigenous biodiversity in Napier. The term “enhance” is uncertain and could result in the loss of remaining significant indigenous biodiversity. The term “restoration” should be used instead. That term is consistent with Policy 13 and 14 of the NPSIB and aligns with Policies 5, 6 and 13 of the NPSFM.	Amend as follows:  Significant indigenous vegetation, <u>and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, in Napier are protected and restored, and biodiversity beyond significant areas is maintained and restored.</u>  <del>Outstanding waterbodies are protected, and the amenity and quality of waterways are maintained, and enhanced.</del>	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /SD-SRCC-O5: Coastal environment	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.22	Oppose	Considers this objective is uncertain in terms of Policy 11 and Policy 14 of the NZCPS. However, if Policy 11 matters are addressed within SD-SRCC-O4 above as sought, that aspect would be resolved. It would clearer to amend the wording for “natural character be preserved and restored” to better reflect Objective 2 of the NZCPS, in particular to include “restoration” given the identified issues. The proposed words “inappropriate subdivision, use and development” in a strategic objective is not supported. This is because how protection is achieved is better set out in the coastal chapter provisions where policy can provide direction on what is inappropriate, ie by avoiding adverse effects on Outstanding Natural Character and landscape as per Policies 13 and 15 of the NZCPS.	Amend as follows:  <u>The natural character, landscape values and biodiversity values of Napier's coastal environment is preserved and restored</u> <del>protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development</del>	Open Submission
SD - Sustainability, Resilience, and Climate Change /Strategic Objectives /SD-SRCC-O6: Climate change adaptation	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.23	Amend	Considers it is important that location as well as design supports climate change adaptation. Climate adaptation also needs to make space for indigenous biodiversity. For example, allowing for landward migration of coastal bird breeding and feeding habitat affected by sea level rise, erosion and storm events.	Amend as follows:  Land use, subdivision, and development <u>location and design supports climate change adaptation and climate-resilience for communities and indigenous biodiversity.</u>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SD - Tangata Whenua /Introduction /	Sera Chambers	150.99	Oppose	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	Open Submission
SD - Tangata Whenua /Introduction /	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.19	Support	Supports SD - Strategic Direction Tanga Whenua as HNZPT supports the partnership approach and active participation referred to, and the protection of sites of significance to Māori.	Retain Introduction, Issues, Objectives and Policies of SD - Strategic Direction Tanga Whenua in their entirety.	Open Submission
SD - Tangata Whenua /Objectives /SD-TW-03: Sites of significance to MāoriThe relationship of tangata whenua with their cultural heritage and with the natural and physical environment is recognised and provided for.	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.24	Amend	Considers that the wording is not consistent with s6(f) of the RMA for the protection of historic heritage, and which includes sites of significance to Māori.	Amend to include protection of sites of significance to Māori.	Open Submission



# SD - Urban Form and Development

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SD - Urban Form and Development /Issues /SD-UFD-I2: Housing supply	Tracey Reyburn	64.2	Support	Supports SD-UFD-I2: Housing supply and Residential Zones intensification provisions in the city centre as they provide for intensification whilst safeguarding the environment. Considers that a CCZ (City Centre Zone) should allow for both retail and residential activities in buildings sympathetic with the Art Deco architectural style.	Retain SD-UFD-I2: Housing supply. Seeks that the CCZ (City Centre Zone) provisions recognise both residential and retail activities, character and heritage qualities to ensure appropriate implementation.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Objectives /SD-UFD-O2: Housing supply and choice	Andrea Millar	105.6	Support	Supports SD-UFD-O2 as it enables housing supply that meets demand and reflects the needs of Napier's communities, such as supported and transitional residential activities that are provided for by Ara Poutama, and also provides high-level support for Ara Poutama to implement its reintegration responsibilities under the PDP.	Retain Strategic Direction Objective SD-UFD-O2.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Objectives /SD-UFD-O8: Social and community facilities	Andrea Millar	105.7	Support	Supports SD-UFD-O8 as it enables the establishment of community facilities, supporting community welling, and encompassing community corrections facilities. Considers the importance role of such activities in rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision and provide for social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety.	Retain Strategic Direction Objective SD-UFD-O8.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Policies /SD-UFD-P2: Housing	Andrea Millar	105.8	Support	Supports SD-UFD-P2 to enables a variety of homes that meet the diverse needs of communities including supported and transitional accommodation activities such as those provided for by Ara Poutama. Considers the importance of Providing strategic policy direction to enable reintegration and rehabilitation and provides high-level support for Ara Poutama to implement responsibilities under the PDP	Retain Strategic Direction Policy SD-UFD-P2.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Policies /SD-UFD-P6: Integration with social facilities	Andrea Millar	105.9	Amend	Supports in part and considers the working to enable establishment of community facilities, which support community wellbeing, and broadly encompass community corrections facilities. Amend for consistency with Strategic Direction Objective SD-UFD-O8.	Amend Strategic Policy SD-UFD-P6 as follows:  SD-UFD-P6: Integration with social facilities  Enable social and community facilities to meet the diverse demographic and cultural needs of people and communities.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Policies	Sera Chambers	150.103	Oppose	considers that the current strategic direction does not take into account provisions on natural hazards. Hawke's Bay Regional Council has recently provided updated information which appears to support future greenfield development in the hills of Napier rather than intensification in low-lying areas of Napier, including Onekawa and Pirimai. It would be prudent of NCC to make any decisions on the medium-density residential zone without taking this current information into account.	opposes on the basis that decisions on the medium-density residential zone should not take this current information from HBRC into account.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Policies /Achieve Objective SD-UFD-O6: Industrial	Sera Chambers	150.104	Amend	considers that a fourth way to achieve this objective should be included to ensure the people of Napier the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development may impact on their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	seeks to amend to add:  <u>d. ensure the people of Napier the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development may impact on their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.</u>	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Objectives /Infrastructure	Tom Anderson	151.20	Support	Supports as it is important that infrastructure and land use planning are integrated.	Retain the objective as notified	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Objectives /SD-UFD-O7: Heretaunga Plains	James Witham	165.10	Amend	Considers that the objective doesn't appear to have a foundation in the issues outlined regarding food supply. Considers that objectives could more widely recognise the benefits of the soils of the Heretaunga Plains and their productive capacity and their use. Also notes the objectives could more closely reflect the language and scope of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Amend SD-UFD-O7: Heretaunga Plains as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:  SD-UFD-O7: Heretaunga Plains  The contribution that <u>the productive capacity of the soils within the Heretaunga Plains and their use for primary production activities</u> makes to food supply <u>and economic wellbeing</u> is protected from inappropriate subdivision, urban use, and development.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Policies /SD-UFD-P3: Greenfield growth	James Witham	165.11	Support	Supports b. insofar as it gives effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Retain the chapeau of SD-UFD-P3: Greenfield growth and b.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SD - Urban Form and Development /Policies /SD-UFD-P3: Greenfield growth	Angela McFlynn	189.4	Amend	Considers that SD-UFD-P3: Greenfield growth Policy as written is contrary to both the NPS-UD and the NPS-HPL which envisage that some HPL land is likely to be required to be rezoned to provide sufficient development capacity within the District.	Amend SD-UFD-P3: Greenfield growth as follows: Ensure that any future expansion of urban limits:  a) requires indicative public access routes to be vested in Council as part of any subdivision; b) <del>avoids restricts</del> urban rezoning in areas with highly productive soils <u>unless</u> <u>(i) , the urban rezoning is required to provide sufficient development capacity to meet and demand for housing or business land to give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020; and</u> <u>(ii) there are no other reasonably practicable and feasible options for providing at least sufficient development capacity within the same locality and market while achieving a well-functioning urban environment; and (iii) the environmental, social, cultural and economic benefits of rezoning outweigh the long-term environmental, social, cultural and economic costs associated with the loss of highly productive land for land-based primary production, taking into account both tangible and intangible values; and</u> c. enables the provision of social facilities to meet the diverse demographic and cultural needs of people and communities.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Policies /SD-UFD-P7: Centre zones	Angela McFlynn	189.5	Oppose	The submitter considers that restricting retail and office activities from establishing outside of the City Centre is not consistent with the NPS-UD which promotes a well-functioning urban environment and reducing greenhouse gas emissions from car travel. The population of Napier is not sufficient to support reliance on public transport, therefore well-functioning urban environments require the ability to access more services and facilities in neighbourhood centres.	Delete SD-UFD-P7: Centre zones and provide for the establishment of the full range of commercial activities in all Centre zones and the Mixed Use Zone to support the development of well-functioning urban environments.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Issues /SD-UFD-I4: Constraints on industrial growth	Ellen Robotham	198.26	Amend	Considers the issue accurately reflects constraints on industrial growth in Napier, however the Proposed Plan needs to recognise the function of the Airport Zone in hosting light industrial activities.	Seeks clarification that the constraint relates to heavy industrial rather than light industrial activities that can be accommodated within the Airport Zone.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Objectives /SD-UFD-O4: Economic activity	Ellen Robotham	198.27	Support	Supports that economic and innovation activities be located in appropriate places.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Objectives /SD-UFD-O6: Industrial zone	Ellen Robotham	198.28	Support	Supports the recognition of the contribution of industrial development to the wellbeing of the region.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Objectives /SD-UFD-O9: Infrastructure and land use planning	Ellen Robotham	198.29	Support	Considers it is important that future urban development is appropriately provided for by infrastructure, and that sensitive urban development (for example new residential developments) does not give rise to reverse sensitivity effects on existing infrastructure.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Policies /SD-UFD-P3: Greenfield growth	Ellen Robotham	198.30	Amend	Considers it is important that greenfield residential development does not give rise to reverse sensitivity effects, particularly for existing infrastructure such as network utilities which have functional and operational requirements.	Amend to insert additional bullet:  b) avoids urban rezoning in areas with highly productive soils, <del>and</del> c) enables the provision of social facilities to meet the diverse demographic and cultural needs of people and communities., <u>and</u> d) <u>avoids potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing significant infrastructure arising from the development of incompatible activities.</u>	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Objectives /SD-UFD-O4: Economic activity	Georgina McPherson	215.26	Support	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this objective and seek that it be retained.	Retain SD-UFD-O4 as notified.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Objectives /SD-UFD-O6: Industrial zones	Georgina McPherson	215.27	Support	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this objective and seek that it be retained.	Retain SD-UFD-O6 as notified.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Policies /SD-UFD-P8: Industrial	Georgina McPherson	215.28	Support	The intent of SD-UFD-P8 to enable port and light industrial activities that serve the Napier community is supported by the Fuel Companies.	Retain as SD-UFD-P8 as notified.	Open Submission

# SD - Urban Form and Development

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SD - Urban Form and Development /Issues /SD-UFD-I1: Compact urban form	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.16	Amend	Considers the importance of compact urban form and the pressure growth can put on the district. A growing population increases a demand for educational facilities. The term 'social facilities' is not defined under the proposed plan, making it unclear if it included educational facilities or not. Requests that educational facilities are explicitly recognised in this objective, to highlight they are a crucial form of social infrastructure required to support the district.Considers the adoption of the Ministry requested amendments would better enable the Ministry to respond to growth and manage its existing and future school network.	Seeks to Amend SD-UFD-I1 to:  Napier's growing population increases demand for housing, employment, business, infrastructure , social <u>and educational</u> facilities, and services. Growth needs to be provided in a way that optimises the efficient use of the existing urban area and supports integrated land use, infrastructure and development.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Objectives /SD-UFD-O1: Compact urban form	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.17	Support	Supports SD-UFD-O1 as it encourages an integrated urban form and the growth of the districts public transportation networks.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Objectives /SD-UFD-O8: Social and community facilities	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.18	Amend	Considers community facilities do not include education facilities within its definition, and the term social facilities are not defined in the plan. educational facilities are a critical part of social infrastructure required to support the wellbeing of learning communities. Requests that educational facilities are provided for within SD-UFD-O8.	Amend SD-UFD-O8 to:  Social, <u>educational</u> and community facilities support the wellbeing of all members of our growing community.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Objectives /SD-UFD-O9: Infrastructure and land use planning	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.19	Support	Supports integrated planning outcomes.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Objectives /SD-UFD-O10: Quality environment	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.20	Support	Supports SD-UFD-O10, as it encourages safe environments for students to reside in, engage in recreational activities, and commute to school.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Issues /SD-UFD-I4: Constraints on industrial growth	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.20	Oppose	The submitter opposes Issue SD-UFD-I4 in that there are many existing businesses present within Napier City, that have invested significantly into their operations and infrastructure, who need certainty and confidence for their decision making on future operations and investment. It is important to appropriately recognise and provide for the operation, intensification and expansion of existing businesses, including larger-scale industrial activities, within the PDP. Also, not all of the city's existing larger-scale industrial activities need to be able to connect to the city's services.	Amend Issue SD-UFD-I4 as follows:  SD-I14: Constraints on industrial growth  Napier's limited land area and proximity to the Ahuriri Estuary and coast provide limited opportunities for industrial growth, particularly for industries with potential adverse effects on sensitive receiving environments.  <u>Explanation</u>  Industrial activities are an important component of Napier's employment portfolio. Due to a range of factors including limited suitable land area, poor ground conditions, and proximity to the Ahuriri estuary and inner harbour, <u>new</u> larger-scale industrial activities are encouraged to locate on more suitable land outside of Napier where appropriate services to support such industry are available.Taking an integrated approach enables appropriate industrial activity to <u>establish, intensify and/or expand</u> <del>be located</del> in Napier where traffic can be managed, suitable infrastructure is available, and the adverse effects can be managed through the resource consent process.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Objectives /SD-UFD-O4: Economic activity	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.21	Support	Supports SD-UFD-O4: Economic activity as providing for the city's economic well-being, by enabling economic activity, and innovation, where activities are appropriately located (i.e., industrial activities within industrial zones), is an appropriate planning approach.	Retain Objective SD-UFD-O4 as notified.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Objectives /SD-UFD-O6: Industrial zones	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.22	Support	The submitter supports SD-UFD-O6: Industrial zones as it is agreed that industrial activities and development contribute to the economic well-being of the city and broader region. It is also agreed that industrial development needs to ensure that existing infrastructure is used efficiently, as well as sustainably. However, it is important to recognise that it is not always possible to connect to reticulated infrastructure or networks, nor necessary to do so in relation to managing adverse effects on the environment.	Retain Objective SD-UFD-O6 as notified.	Open Submission

# SD - Urban Form and Development

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SD - Urban Form and Development /Policies /SD-UFD-P3: Greenfield growth	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.23	Amend	Considers SD-UFD-P3: Greenfield growth should be amended as the requirement, under this policy, to avoid highly productive soils, in relation to any future expansion of urban limits, is not entirely consistent with the framework now in place under the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL).	Amend Policy SD-UFD-P3 as follows:  Ensure that any future expansion of urban limits:  a. requires indicative public access routes to be vested in Council as part of any subdivision; b. <del>avoids urban rezoning in areas with</del> <u>ensures that</u> highly productive <del>soils</del> <u>land is protected for use in land-based primary production</u> , and  enables the provision of social facilities to meet the diverse demographic and cultural needs of people and communities.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Policies /SD-UFD-P8: Industrial	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.24	Amend	The submitter considers that SD-UFD-P8: Industrial Policy should be amended as the PDP does not propose any Heavy Industry Zones and Clause (c) of this policy should be amended to identify that heavy industry should be located within the GIZ. In addition, as a definition for 'Heavy Industry' is included in the PDP, there is no need to include a description of what heavy industry is within this part of the policy.	Amend Policy SD-UFD-P8 as follows:  Achieve Objective SD-UFD-O6: Industrial by:  enabling light industrial activity that serves the local Napier community throughout the Industrial and Mixed Use a. Zones; b. enabling industrial activity that utilises the locational benefits of the port and airport through provisions of the Industrial Zones, Port Zone and Airport Zone, and c. ensuring that <del>new</del> heavy industry activities <del>that generate air or trade waste discharge</del> are located in a <del>Heavy-General</del> Industry Zone.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Issues /SD-UFD-I2: Housing supply	Alan White	249.9	Amend	With the increasing weather events that are occurring in Napier submitter has concerns regarding the number of large areas within the existing residential areas that have not been developed/built on. To meet the housing demand, Council should either encourage landowners of these areas to develop them by providing some incentive to do so for a set period of time. If development does not occur within that time, those landowners should be rated at a higher rate for leaving the potential of the properties lie undeveloped.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Issues /SD-UFD-I6: Productive soils	Leanne Roberts	257.18	Amend	Considers the intent of the issue is supported; however, the term productive soils is not defined. To ensure clarity, HortNZ seeks that a definition for productive soils is included that incorporates both versatile soils and highly productive land. The issue should refer to highly productive land.	Seeks to amend SD-UFD-I6: The <del>high quality soils</del> <u>highly productive land and versatile soils</u> of the Heretaunga Plains are under threat from pressure for ongoing urban expansion.  Explanation.  <del>Versatile and productive soils</del> <u>and highly productive land</u> are a limited resource in Napier.  Seeks to define productive soils as highly productive land and versatile soils.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Objectives /SD-UFD-O7: Heretaunga Plains	Leanne Roberts	257.19	Amend	Supports the objective and recognition of Heretaunga Plains. However, it should specifically refer to highly productive land. It is not only urban use that can compromise soils, and this should be recognised in the objective.	Seeks to amend SD-UFD-O7:  The contribution of soils, <u>including highly productive land</u> , within the Heretaunga Plains makes to food supply is protected from inappropriate subdivision, <del>urban</del> use and development.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Policies /SD-UFD-P3: Greenfield growth	Leanne Roberts	257.2	Amend	HortNZ supports that urban rezoning avoids areas of highly productive land, however the reference in the policy should use 'land' not 'soils' to be consistent with the definition.	Seeks to amend SD-UFD-P3 b) to read:  Avoids urban rezoning in areas of highly productive <del>soils</del> <u>land</u> .	Open Submission

# SD - Urban Form and Development

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SD - Urban Form and Development /Objectives /SD-UFD-O2: Housing supply and choice	Nichola Nicholson	264.7	Amend	Generally support the high-level strategic objectives in the PDP's 'Urban Form and Development' Strategic Direction chapter. Seek clarification on how those strategic objectives (and associated policies etc) relate to, or may be further amended by, the Variation intended to be notified in 2023 relating to natural hazards and biodiversity.	Amend objective SD-UFD-O2 (Housing supply and choice) as follows:  "Housing supply and choice meets demand and reflects the needs of Napier's communities <u>and is located in areas away from the risk of natural hazards</u> " (or words to similar effect)	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Objectives /SD-UFD-O1: Compact urban form	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.15	Support	Supports objective UFD-O1, as it promotes smaller focal centres within Napier. Considers that providing smaller focal centres around the growth areas identified within the Napier Spatial Picture provides an opportunity to integrate an urban form, which provides for a mix of community land uses with the transport network. Considers that encouraging a compact urban form that provides for walkable access to facilities will encourage active travel modes, especially when supported by end of trip facilities.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Objectives /SD-UFD-O9: Infrastructure and land use planning	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.16	Support	Support the directive to promote compact urban growth in existing urban areas, which eases pressure on the state highway network promoted by ribbon developments.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Objectives /SD-UFD-O9: Infrastructure and land use planning	Alec Duncan	288.17	Support	Fire and Emergency supports SD-UFD-O9 as it recognises the benefits of integrated infrastructure and land use planning to support identified growth areas. As defined, infrastructure includes the water supply distribution system and the transport network. For Fire and Emergency, it is important that the reticulated water supply network and roading network for future growth areas are adequately designed to support the intended future land uses and are designed in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 and the Designers' guide to firefighting operations Emergency vehicle access F5-02 GD.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Policies /SD-UFD-P5: Integration with infrastructure	Alec Duncan	288.18	Support	Supports SD-UFD-P5 as it requires all new housing developments to be adequately serviced by infrastructure to meet the health and safety of residents now and in the future. It is important that the water supply distribution system and the transport network is future proofed so that there is sufficient capacity in the networks to service existing and future development while enabling an efficient and effective emergency response. All new housing developments should be required to demonstrate that there is sufficient capacity in both the water supply and transport networks. Where there is insufficient capacity (such as firefighting water supply) or where the transport network may be compromised (such as insufficient access or parking), the development must demonstrate how any adverse effects or capacity constraints can be mitigated.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Objectives /SD-UFD-O7: Heretaunga Plains	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.28	Amend	Considers it is not clear from reading the objective that the intent, as set out in the s32 Report, is to "ensure that the high- quality soils within this locality are sustained for future generations."	Amend as follows:  The contribution that the soils within the Heretaunga Plains makes to food supply is protected <u>and sustained for future generations from inappropriate subdivision, urban use and development.</u>	Open Submission
SD - Urban Form and Development /Objectives /SD-UFD-O9: Infrastructure and land use planning	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.29	Amend	Considers it is not clear from reading the objective that the intent includes to "mitigate the adverse effects of development on the receiving environment and from climate change through reducing carbon emissions" as set out in the s32 report. Considers the term "avoid" should be included as necessary to give effect to the NZCPS, NPSIB and for integrated management under the RPS.	Amend as follows:  Infrastructure planning is integrated with land use planning to facilitate efficient development in identified growth areas; <u>including by reducing carbon emissions and avoiding or mitigating adverse effects on receiving environments.</u>	Open Submission

# FC - Financial Contributions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
FC - Financial Contributions /Policies	Tom Anderson	151.79	Support	Supports that the policy is directive about "all infrastructure". Notes that often infrastructure which is provided by private entities, such as telecommunication companies, have difficulty recovering costs. The telecommunication companies wish to work with Council to determine how financial contributions are distributed under this policy.	Retain the policy as notified.	Open Submission
FC - Financial Contributions / /	Angela McFlynn	189.6	Amend	Considers that the SW - Stormwater Section of the Plan requires that there be no increase in stormwater runoff from a site in association with any subdivision or redevelopment of land. Any subdivision / land development undertaken in accordance with those hydrological neutrality rules will therefore have no effect on existing stormwater infrastructure, and therefore no financial contributions should be payable for upgrades / new stormwater infrastructure as there will be no work required to accommodate additional demand from future developments. Attempting to charge financial contributions in these circumstances would be contrary to the proposed FC - Financial Contributions Objectives and Policies.	Amend the FC - Financial Contributions provisions to remove the requirement to pay stormwater attributable contributions where developments will not generate any additional demand on stormwater infrastructure as required by the proposed stormwater rules.	Open Submission
FC - Financial Contributions /FC - Financial Contributions - Standards Table /FC-S2: Residential multi-unit development	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.60	Amend	The current drafting of this standard doesn't make it clear how minor residential units should be treated in terms of financial contributions. The intention is that permitted minor residential units e.g. no more than 80sqm in the General Residential Zone, would be exempt from paying financial contributions are they are enabled as an ancillary extension to the primary residential unit. This approach is also proposed for the subdivision chapter to ensure where minor residential units are subdivided from the primary unit that the appropriate provisions for a full new site, including FCs, apply.	Amend as follows: FC-S2: Residential <del>multi-unit</del> development 1. All <del>multi-unit</del> developments for residential purposes must meet the following requirements: a) on every <del>multi-unit</del> development for residential purposes, the financial contribution must be paid to the Council as set out in Appendix 15 Table 1 (subject to the calculations referred to in FC-S4 and the adjustment as a result of the indexation referred to in FC-S5) for the second and each subsequent residential unit of the development (Note: for the purpose of this standard, residential unit excludes a minor residential unit that meets the relevant activity conditions in the zone activity table), and, b) such financial contributions shall become payable on the granting of the resource consent relating to the development and must be paid before a building consent will be issued. In the event that no resource consent is required the financial contribution shall be paid prior to any building consent being uplifted.	Open Submission
FC - Financial Contributions /Issues /FC-I1: New subdivision and development places additional demand on capacity of infrastructural services and the extension of those services	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.17	Support	Supports the recognition of the potential effects additional subdivision and development place on the capacity of infrastructural services including the existing roading infrastructure.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
FC - Financial Contributions /Objectives /FC-O2:	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.18	Support	Supports the directive of the objective ensuring reasonable costs are met by new development to ensure the provision of safe and efficient infrastructure.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
FC - Financial Contributions /Objectives /FC-O3:	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.19	Amend	Seeks to amend the objective to remove any potential ambiguity by clarifying that adverse effects resulting from subdivision and development apply to all infrastructure beyond what is administered by Council.	Amend as follows: To ensure that the adverse effects of new land development, including subdivision, on the city's infrastructure are mitigated using financial contributions from new development.	Open Submission
FC - Financial Contributions /Policies /FC-P5	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.20	Support	Supports the directive of FC-P5 and FC-P8 which supports integrated planning and provision and development of infrastructure, subdivision and development.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
FC - Financial Contributions /Policies /FC-P8	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.21	Support	Support the directive of FC-P5 and FC-P8 which supports integrated planning and provision and development of infrastructure, subdivision and development.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
FC - Financial Contributions /Policies /FC-P6	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.22	Support	Supports the upgrading of existing infrastructure and services outside of land being subdivided where appropriate, sharing the cost of upgrading the infrastructure will not fall on the tax public sector.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

# FC - Financial Contributions

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
FC - Financial Contributions /Policies /FC-P9	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.23	Support	Supports the upgrading of existing infrastructure and services outside of land being subdivided where appropriate, sharing the cost of upgrading the infrastructure will not fall on the tax public sector.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
FC - Financial Contributions /FC - Financial Contributions - Standards Table /FC-S1: Subdivision	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.24	Amend	Requests an amendment to the exception outlined in subclause b, noting the rule shall not apply to create a new title for an existing dwelling, where there is no change in access arrangements, as subdivision around an existing dwelling could result in changes to the road network.	Amend subclause b as follows: b. this rule does not apply where the subdivision is solely for the purpose of creating a title for an existing dwelling unit with <u>no change to the access arrangements</u> , and...	Open Submission
FC - Financial Contributions /Objectives /FC-O1:	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.30	Amend	Considers that the objective needs to include environmental values to enable environmental corridors and the protection of indigenous biodiversity in urban and suburban areas.	Amend as follows: To maintain and enhance the health, safety, and wellbeing of people and the amenity and cultural <u>and environmental</u> values of the city while sustaining physical resources for use and development for future generations.	Open Submission
FC - Financial Contributions /General /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.31	Oppose	Arising from late notification of the ECO-chapter	Add: <u>"The Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter includes provisions which relate to financial contributions. Where there is a conflict between the Financial Contributions chapter and the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter, the provisions that place greater or additional restrictions on activities with adverse effects on the natural environment will apply"</u>	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R6A	Ray Taylor	21.1	Oppose	Considers the rule appears to block the installation of above-ground poles and lines along public roadsides where a telecommunications company would like to invest in new infrastructure for under-served areas on the fringes of Napier city. The wording referencing lots of 2 ha in rural zones makes it very difficult to understand specifically in relation to roads. The current operative Network Utilities section of the district plan has been serving the city well.	Seeks that the existing Network Utilities rules be carried forward unchanged. If trying to encourage underground-only construction for appearance reasons, suggests that the underground-only rule could still apply to the specific Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and / or River Conservation Zones	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities /	Rebecca Eng	99.28	Amend	Transpower's preference is for the Network Utilities chapter to be entirely self-contained, so that other chapters in the plan do not apply to the National Grid. However, should this approach not be adopted, Transpower has made submissions on other chapters in the Proposed Plan to indicate what changes would be required, whether they are incorporated into the Network Utilities Chapter or remain in their current location.	Amend the Network Utilities Chapter so that it is self-contained, and reference to, and applicability of, other chapters is not required.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Introduction	Rebecca Eng	99.29	Amend	Transpower supports the text and specifically, the reference to electricity transmission. However additional text is sought to recognise the NPSET. Given that this is a National Policy Statement and the objective of that National Policy Statement, it is appropriate to include recognition of the National Grid in the introductory paragraphs.	Amend the text as follows:  The purpose of the Network Utilities chapter is to manage the operation, development, and maintenance of all network utilities. Network utilities are physical resources that include road and rail networks, cycleway and walkway networks, telecommunication networks, radio communication facilities, electricity and gas transmission and distribution networks, infrastructure service networks such as reticulated water, sewerage, trade waste and stormwater drainage networks, and ancillary activities including associated buildings, structures, equipment and customer connections.  <u>The importance of the National Grid has been recognised in the development of the National Policy Statement for Electricity Transmission 2008 (NPSET), the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities) Regulations 2009 and the Regional Policy Statement. The NPSET provides that the district plan must recognise the national significance of the electricity transmission network (the National Grid) by facilitating its operation, maintenance, upgrading and development, while managing both the adverse effects of the network, and managing the adverse effects of other activities on the network.</u>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Introduction	Rebecca Eng	99.30	Amend	A minor amendment is sought to articulate that their upgrade and development is also important.	Amend as follows:  Network utilities are an essential part of the district's infrastructure, and their efficient and effective supply, <del>and</del> maintenance, <u>upgrade and development</u> are important for enabling communities to undertake their everyday activities, for the functioning of the district, and for facilitating and maintaining the health, safety, and general wellbeing of its residents. It also aligns with a number of strategic objectives for the District Plan relating specifically to aligning infrastructure planning with land use planning, supporting economic growth, optimising connectivity, public health and safety, and consideration of the long-term risk of natural hazards and climate change.	Open Submission



# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /Introduction	Rebecca Eng	99.31	Amend	Clarify the relationship between the objectives, policies and rules for network utilities and those of the zones. As the network utilities chapter is located within the "District-wide Matters" section of the Proposed District Plan, this is an appropriate place to clarify that. It is not clear whether objectives and policies in the other chapters (in particular the Overlay chapters) apply. In order to assist with plan interpretation and application, the relationship between the chapters requires clarification and clear explanation. Amendments are suggested to address this.	Amend the text as follows:  To achieve this, the network utility provisions in the District Plan provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of network utilities throughout the district while managing their adverse effects on the environment (particularly in sensitive environments such as the coastal environment, outstanding and significant landscapes, significant natural areas, areas containing cultural or historic heritage values, and areas subject to natural hazards). As many network utilities are lineal and traverse many parts of the district, it is considered appropriate that a single set of <u>objectives, policies and rules</u> , be provided that apply to <u>Network Utilities</u> across the District. <u>As such, the Network Utilities chapter is stand alone as it applies to Network Utility Operators and provisions in other chapters do not apply.</u>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Introduction	Rebecca Eng	99.32	Amend	Supports the text in so far as it relates to the effects on other activities on Network Utilities. However the rules associated with activities affecting the National Grid can be found throughout the District Plan and not just in the Network Utilities chapter, while the objectives and policies that manage these activities are found in the Network Utilities chapter. The text is potentially misleading with respect to the National Grid in that there are other applicable chapters. In order to correctly articulate the location of provisions specific to the National Grid, amended text is sought.	Amend the text as follows:  Provisions to manage the effects of other activities on network utilities (including state highway and rail corridors, the electricity distribution network, <del>the National Grid</del> , and gas transmission pipelines) are contained, in the relevant chapters for zones and precincts, special overlays, and district-wide chapters such as the Noise chapter. <u>Provisions to manage the effects of land use and earthwork activities on the National Grid are contained in the Network Utilities Chapter, with subdivision near the National Grid managed in the Subdivision Chapter.</u>  A number of network utility operators, including the Napier City Council, also utilise their ability to designate critical sites for a specified network utility purpose. Designations are identified on the Planning Maps and are listed in the 'Designations' section in 'Part 3 - Area-Specific Matters' in the District Plan.	Open Submission
NU - Network Utilities/Introduction	Rebecca Eng	99.33	Support	Transpower supports the text which relates to the NESETA and relationship to district plan rules.	Retain the text	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Issues /NU-I1: Essential role of network utilities	Rebecca Eng	99.34	Support	Transpower supports the issue	Retain the issue	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Issues /NU-I2: Management of adverse effects of network utilities	Rebecca Eng	99.35	Amend	Transpower supports the issue but seeks amendment to refer to 'operational need'.	Amend the issue as follows:  The effects of network utilities can also have greater impact on residential environments than other areas, and on sites of significance throughout the city, such as significant natural areas, outstanding landscape features, heritage sites, and cultural sites. The siting of network utilities can also potentially worsen risk in areas subject to natural hazards. Sometimes these adverse effects have to be balanced alongside recognising any functional need, <u>operational need</u> or constraints that may limit where a network utility can be sited.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Issues /NU-I3: The impact of activities on network utilities	Rebecca Eng	99.36	Support	Transpower supports the issue, and in particular the recognition that some activities can compromise network utilities.	Retain the issue.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-O1: Essential role of network utilities	Rebecca Eng	99.37	Support	Transpower supports recognition of the essential role of network utilities.	Retain the objective.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-O2: Adverse effects of network utilities	Rebecca Eng	99.38	Support	The recognition of the functional and operational needs of network utilities is supported. This approach will give effect to the NPSET and the RPS OBJ 33. The reference to 'as far as is practicable' is supported as it reflects that there are operational needs and technical constraints as to how far adverse effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Retain the objective.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-O3: Adverse effects on network utilities	Rebecca Eng	99.39	Support	Transpower supports the objective as it appropriately recognises the potential for activities to compromise network utilities, in accordance with RPS Objective OBJ 32 and Policy 10 of the NPSET.	Retain the objective.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P1: Essential role of network utilities	Rebecca Eng	99.40	Support	Transpower supports the recognition of the national, regional and local importance and benefits of network utilities, and requirement to provide for these benefits by enabling the operation, maintenance and minor upgrading, and providing for upgrades and development While the policy is not specific to the National Grid, it does give effect to the NPSET.	Retain the policy.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P2: Adverse effects of network utilities	Rebecca Eng	99.41	Amend	Amendment is sought to clause a. to recognise the nature of existing network utilities and confine clause a. to upgrade and development. An amendment is also sought to remove reference to 'electricity transmission' as it is covered by the National Grid.	Amend the policy as follows:  NU-P2: Adverse effects of network utilities Require the development, operation, maintenance, repair, upgrading, and removal of infrastructure to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects, including by: a. <u>in relation to upgrading and development</u> , avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on: i. natural and physical resources; ii. amenity values, including from shading, visual dominance, noise, vibration, light spill, traffic and access, dust nuisance; iii. the safe and efficient operation of other network utilities, including effects on electricity distribution, <del>electricity transmission</del> and the National Grid, gas transmission pipelines, road and rail networks, and infrastructural service networks, and ix. the health, wellbeing, and safety of people and communities, including by minimising risks from exposure to radiofrequency fields, electric and magnetic fields, and from natural hazards. b. requiring compliance with recognised standards and guidelines for the potential adverse effects of noise, vibration, radiofrequency fields, and electric and magnetic fields. c. encouraging the progressive undergrounding of appropriate network utilities where technically feasible and practicable. d. encouraging the co-siting and sharing of facilities and other innovative solutions. e. encouraging the removal of redundant and superseded above ground network utility facilities.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P3: Adverse effects of network utilities on protected areas and sites of significance	Rebecca Eng	99.42	Amend	Considers that while the policy is supported, clarity is required around the terms: significant landscapes, high natural character areas, and significant amenity features, as none of the terms are defined in the PDP or identified on the planning maps. Specific to natural features and landscapes, Transpower assumes the policy should refer to 'Outstanding natural features, Special character landscapes, and Special character features'. A 's' is also sought at the end of 'need'.  Clarification is also sought as why clause 1. relates to the effects on the areas. whereas clause 2. relates to managing the effects on the 'values and attributes' of the areas.	Seeks to amend the policy as follows:  NU-P3: Adverse effects of network utilities on protected areas and sites of significance 1. Manage the adverse effects of upgrades to and development of new network utilities on: a. <del>outstanding natural features and significant landscapes, and special character landscapes</del> b. significant natural areas; c. sites of significance to Māori, and d. historic heritage areas, heritage items, and notable trees. while recognising the extent to which adverse effects can be avoided or may be constrained by a network utility's functional or operational needs. 2. Manage the adverse effects of upgrades to and the development of new network utilities on the values and attributes of areas identified in the District Plan as: a. <del>high natural character areas, special character features, and</del> b. <del>heritage character areas, and</del> c. <del>significant amenity features.</del>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P4: Adverse effects on network utilities	Rebecca Eng	99.43	Amend	<p>Considers that the policy recognises the adverse effects of subdivision, land use and development on the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid, and is therefore supported. The policy largely gives effect to Policies 10 and 11 of the NPSET. The National Grid can be affected by other activities that establish beneath or in close proximity to its lines and/or structures. Such activities can generate reverse sensitivity effects where landowners/operators request a Council to impose constraints on existing infrastructure to manage effects such as noise, reduced visual amenity, radio and television interference, perceived Electric and Magnetic Field ('EMF') effects, or interference with business activities beneath the lines.</p> <p>The policy is also supported in that it recognises that in addition to reverse sensitivity effects, subdivision, land use and development can also compromise the National Grid through activities such as access to the National Grid assets being blocked, buildings and structures being located close to assets and causing risk and safety issues (such as flashovers) or the location of buildings and activities, including 'sensitive activities' such as schools and residential properties, beneath or in close proximity to lines and/or structures can limit Transpower's ability to maintain, upgrade and develop the National Grid.</p> <p>Earthworks (And vertical holes) can adversely affect the National Grid. Specific to the National Grid, earthworks have the potential to undermine transmission line structures, generate dust, reduce the safe clearances between the ground and conductors, and restrict access to lines, potentially resulting in potential tower failure and operational constraints. It is noted the</p>	<p>Seeks the policy be amended as follows:</p> <p>NU-P4: Adverse effects on network utilities Protect network utilities from the adverse effects of subdivision, <u>earthworks</u>, use and development that may constrain or compromise the safe, effective, secure, and efficient operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of network utilities and the safety and amenity values of people and the community, including by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>managing new activities through setbacks and design controls, where necessary, to achieve appropriate protection of a network utility;</li> <li>managing new activities that are sensitive to noise adjoining the railway corridor;</li> <li>managing access to the railway corridor and to the national, regional, and arterial road network;</li> <li>managing light spill and glare from activities on road users and aircraft;</li> <li>avoiding physical obstructions within the Airport Zone;</li> <li>managing land disturbance and activities in the vicinity of electricity distribution infrastructure including cables, poles, and substations, and maintaining safe electrical clearance distances under electricity distribution lines and support structures;</li> <li>ensuring that <del>land disturbance</del> <u>earthworks and vertical holes, subdivision, buildings, structures</u> and activities within the National Grid Yard, <u>and subdivision within the National Grid Subdivision Corridor, or within the vicinity of a designated</u></li> </ol>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P6: Adverse effects of the National Grid Yard and National Grid Corridor	Rebecca Eng	99.44	Amend	<p>Considers the development of the National Grid must be managed to ensure that the potential for adverse effects is appropriately managed while recognising the significance of the National Grid and the constraints under which it operates. The NPSET recognises the national significance of the National Grid and provides a suite of specific policies which are required to be given effect to in the district plan. The NPSET requires the District Plan to include objectives and policies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allow for the consideration of technical constraints and operational requirements under which the National Grid operates e.g. the linear nature of the transmission lines.</li> <li>Have regard to the extent to which adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated through the route, site, and method selection process.</li> <li>Ensure planning and development of the National Grid has regard to the existing environment.</li> </ul> <p>The above means that policies, plans and decision makers must take in to account the characteristics of the National Grid, its technical and operational constraints, and the route, site and method selection process when considering the adverse effects of new National Grid infrastructure on the environment. Transpower seeks a standalone policy as the most efficient way to give effect to the NPSET and provisions of a specific policy for the National Grid is consistent with the approach sought and adopted across other district (and regional) plans across the country. In this context, and on this basis Policy NU-P6 is supported in principle. As such, while Policies NU-P1, NU-P2 and NU-P3 provide a policy framework for addressing the effects of network utilities, they do not give effect to the NPSET in terms of recognising the clear policy directives in respect of the National Grid. Notwithstanding its support for the specific National Grid effects policy, amendments are sought to the policy as follows:- Removal of reference to National Grid Yard and National</p>	<p>Seeks to amend the policy as follows:</p> <p><del>NU-P6: Adverse effects of the National Grid Yard and National Grid Corridor</del></p> <p>Enable major upgrading and development of the National Grid while managing adverse effects on the environment, including by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>when considering measures to avoid, remedy and mitigate adverse effects of National Grid activities:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>considering the constraints imposed by locational, technical, and operational requirements;</li> <li><del>b.</del> <u>having regard to the extent to which effects have been avoided, remedied, or mitigated by route, site, or method selection;</u></li> <li><u>where appropriate, using substantial upgrades as an opportunity to reduce existing adverse effects</u></li> </ol> </li> <li>in urban areas, avoiding adverse effects on town centres, areas of high recreation value or amenity, and existing sensitive activities, and</li> <li>in rural areas, seeking to avoid adverse effects <u>on areas and values identified in Schedule 2 (Natural Feature and Landscapes), Schedule 3 (Historic Heritage), Schedule 5 (Archaeological Sites), Sites of Significance to Maori, and Significant Natural Areas.</u> <del>outstanding natural landscapes, high natural character areas, areas of high recreation value and amenity, and existing sensitive activities.</del></li> <li><u>Where the National Grid has a functional or operational need</u></li> </ol>	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R5: Construction of new network utilities and upgrading of existing network utilities (that are not regulated by an NES) within the National Grid Yard (other than for the reticulation and storage of water for irrigation purposes carried out by a network utility operator) in all zones and precincts	Rebecca Eng	99.45	Amend	<p>Supports the provision of a permitted rule for certain network utility activities within the National Grid Yard subject to certain standards being met. Notwithstanding the support, amendments are sought to the rule as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amendment to the title to include 'electricity generation that connects to the National Grid', as such activities are not captured by S166 of the RMA as a network utility.</li> <li>- Removal of reference to 'that are not regulated by an NES' to ensure the rule applies to activities subject to the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities) Regulations 2016.</li> <li>- Inclusion of a new condition (4) that there be no loss of access to a National Grid Support Structure. Ongoing access to required for maintenance and emergency works.</li> </ul>	<p>Amend Rule NU-R5 as follows:            NU-R5: Construction of new network utilities and upgrading of existing network utilities <del>(that are not regulated by an NES), or any part of electricity generation that connects to the National Grid,</del> within the National Grid Yard (other than for the reticulation and storage of water for irrigation purposes carried out by a network utility operator) in all zones and precincts            NU-R5A            Activity Status: Permitted            Where:            The activity complies with relevant standards (NU-S1 - NU-S11);The activity complies with standard NU-S12 (Radio Frequency Fields) and standard NU-S13 (Electric and Magnetic Fields), andThe activity complies with the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances (NZECP) 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663 under all National Grid transmission line operating conditions.Not result in the loss of vehicle access to a National Grid support structure</p> <p>NU-R5B            Activity Status where activity condition 1 is not met: Restricted Discretionary            Matters of discretion are:            The relevant matters of discretion for the standard infringed;Where more than one standard will be infringed, the cumulative effects of all infringements considered together;Whether alternative locations, routes, or other options</p>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R6: Construction of new network utilities (that are not regulated by an NES) not already provided for in NU-R4 (within the Airport Zone) and NU-R5 (within National Grid Yard) in all zones and precincts, except the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and/or River Conservation Zones	Rebecca Eng	99.46	Support	<p>Support the rules specific to the National Grid, Rules NU-R6, NU-R7, NU-R12 and NU-R14 all manage the construction of new national grid assets within the city.</p> <p>Rule 6 relates to all zones and precincts excluding the Estuary Foreshore, Reserve and River Conservation zones. Where the standards are not met, consent is required for a restricted discretionary activity (defaulting to non-complying where the Electric and Magnetic field standard is not met).</p> <p>Above ground assets within the Estuary Foreshore, Reserve and River Conservation zones are a discretionary activity under Rule NU-R14.It is noted that rules R5, R6 and R12 all include the qualifier 'that are not regulated by an NES'. This qualifier does not apply to the National Grid as the NESETA does regulate new National Grid assets. However the NES-telecommunications will be applicable.</p> <p>Transpower supports the rules as they provide an appropriate consenting framework in which to consider new National Grid assets. The activity status give effect to the NPSET, specifically Policy 1 and Policy 2.</p>	Retain Rule NU-R6 as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R7: Construction of new underground network utilities in the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and/or River Conservation Zones	Rebecca Eng	99.47	Support	<p>Support rules specific to the National Grid, Rules NU-R6, NU-R7, NU-R12 and NU-R14 all manage the construction of new National Grid assets within the city.</p> <p>Rule 7 relates to new underground assets within the Estuary Foreshore, Reserve and River Conservation zones. Where the standards are not met, consent is required for a restricted discretionary activity (defaulting to non-complying where the Electric and Magnetic field standard is not met).</p> <p>Transpower supports the rules as they provide an appropriate consenting framework in which to consider new National Grid assets. The activity status gives effect to the NPSET, specifically Policy 1 and Policy 2.</p>	Retain Rule NU-R7 as notified.	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R12: New above ground network utilities within the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and/or River Conservation Zones (that are not regulated by an NES)	Rebecca Eng	99.48	Support	Support rules specific to the National Grid, Rules NU-R6, NU-R7, NU-R12 and NU-R14 all manage the construction of new National Grid assets within the city. Rule 12 relates to new above ground assets within the Estuary Foreshore, Reserve and River Conservation zones. Where the standards are not met, consent is required for a restricted discretionary activity (defaulting to non-complying where the Electric and Magnetic field standard is not met). It is noted that rules R5, R6 and R12 all include the qualifier 'that are not regulated by an NES'. This qualifier does not apply to the National Grid as the NESETA does regulate new National Grid assets. However the NES-telecommunications will be applicable. Transpower supports the rules as they provide an appropriate consenting framework in which to consider new National Grid assets. The activity status give effect to the NPSET, specifically Policy 1 and Policy 2.	Retain Rule NU-R12 as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R13: Buildings or structures within the National Grid Yard in all zones	Rebecca Eng	99.49	Amend	Transpower supports NU-R13 (and NU-R13A and NU-13B) on the basis it gives effect to Policy 10 and Policy 11 of the NPSET. There are health and safety issues of activities located in within proximity to the National Grid, and the National Grid can be affected by other activities that establish beneath or in close proximity to its lines and/or structures, generating reverse sensitivity effects where landowners/ operators request a Council to impose constraints on existing infrastructure to manage effects such as noise, reduced visual amenity, radio and television interference, perceived Electric and Magnetic Field ('EMF') effects, or interference with business activities beneath the lines. Access to support structures can also be compromised, thereby affecting Transpower's ability to operate and maintain the assets as well as respond to any emergency situations. The provisions sought in relation to the National Grid Yard are intended to allow for the reasonable use of land inside the transmission line corridor, with standards and rules imposed to ensure that any land use and development that might compromise the National Grid is either managed or avoided. Specific to the 12 m 'National Grid Yard', there are some activities within the National Grid Yard that will not significantly compromise the operation, maintenance or any upgrade of the network, due to their nature and small scale. Certain structures are less problematic within 12 m of the line on the basis they are unlikely to "build out" a transmission line. The access or use of these structures can be restricted without causing animal welfare or business disruption issues, and they do not introduce intensive uses or heavily frequented workplaces with long durations of exposure to risk. Examples of development that should be avoided within the National Grid Yard include commercial buildings and intensive uses/development, dairy sheds, piggeries, poultry sheds, and commercial greenhouses. The	Amend Rule 13 as follows;  NU-R13: Buildings, or structures or activities within the National Grid Yard, in all zones  NU-R13A All zones Activity Status: Permitted Where: 1. The activity is not a sensitive activity. 2. The building or structure is not for the handling or storage of Class 1-4 hazardous substances (Hazard Classification Notice 2020) with explosive or flammable intrinsic properties (except this does not apply to accessory use and storage of hazardous substances in domestic scale quantities). 3. The building... 4. All buildings, structures and activities permitted by 1. 2. or 3. above must: a. <del>The building or structure must have a vertical clearance of 10 m below the lowest point of a conductor under all transmission lines and building operating conditions</del> meet the electrical distances required by NZECP 34: 2001 under all transmission line and building operation conditions. b. <u>Not physically impede vehicular access to a National Grid support structure; and</u> c. <del>5. The building or structure is be</del> located at least 12 m from the outer visible edge of a foundation of a National Grid transmission	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R14: Activities not otherwise provided for (that are not regulated by an NES)	Rebecca Eng	99.50	Support	Specific to the National Grid, Rules NU-R6, NU-R7, NU-R12 and NU-R14 all manage the construction of new National Grid assets within the city. Rule 14 is the catch all discretionary rule. Transpower supports the rules as they provide an appropriate consenting framework in which to consider new National Grid assets. The activity status give effect to the NPSET, specifically Policy 1 and Policy 2.	Retain NU-R14 as notified.	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R9: New amateur radio configuration in all zones and precincts	Rebecca Eng	99.51	Amend	Supports the intent of the rule and condition relating to the non-complying activity status for new amateur radio configurations within the National Grid Yard, however the activity would already be captured by Rule NU-R13. Amendment is therefore sought in the Transpower submission to include within the non-complying rule, "or the activity is not otherwise specifically provided for."	<p>Transpower seeks deletion of condition 4 from the rule as follows:NU-R9A</p> <p>Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The activity ...</li> <li>2. The activity complies with NU-S14 (Amateur Radio Configuration), <del>and</del></li> <li><del>3. The activity is not within the National Grid Yard.</del></li> </ol> <p>NU-R9B</p> <p>Activity Status where activity conditions 1 or 3 are not met: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The relevant ..</li> </ol> <p>Notification: Any application under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified.</p> <p>Activity Status where activity conditions 2 <del>or 4</del> <u>is</u> not met: Non-complying</p>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R10: New electrical vehicle charging facilities in all zones and precincts	Rebecca Eng	99.52	Amend	While Transpower supports the intent of the rule and condition, the activity would be captured by Rule NU-R13, and specifically the amendment sought in the Transpower submission to include within the non-complying rule, "or the activity is not otherwise specifically provided for.".	<p>On the basis NU-R13 is amended as sought in the Transpower submission, Transpower seeks deletion of condition 4 from the rule as follows:NU-R10A</p> <p>Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The activity is installed in association with an existing permitted or consented vehicle park, vehicle depot, or garage structure;</li> <li>2. The activity complies with standards (NU-S1 - NU-S11);</li> <li>3. The activity complies with standard NU-S12 (Radio Frequency Fields) and standard NU-S13 (Electric and Magnetic Fields), <del>and</del></li> <li><del>4. The activity is not within the National Grid Yard.</del></li> </ol> <p>NU-R10B</p> <p>Activity Status where activity condition 2 is not met: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <p>The relevant matters of discretion for the standard infringed;Where more than one standard will be infringed, the cumulative effects of all infringements considered together, andThe matters set out in policy NU-P4.</p> <p>Notification: Any application under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified.</p> <p>Activity Status where activity condition 1 is not met: Discretionary</p> <p>Activity Status where activity conditions 3 <del>or 4</del> <u>is</u> not met: Non-complying</p>	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R11: Temporary network utilities in all zones and precincts	Rebecca Eng	99.53	Amend	While Transpower supports the intent of the rule and condition, the activity would be captured by Rule NU-R13, and specifically the amendment sought in the Transpower submission to include within the non-complying rule, "or the activity is not otherwise specifically provided for."	<p>On the basis NU-R13 is amended as sought in the Transpower submission, Transpower seeks deletion of condition 6 from the rule as follows:NU-R11A</p> <p>Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The activity operates for a maximum of 12 months;</li> <li>2. The temporary network utility and associated buildings and structures are removed from the site when the operation of the activity ceases;</li> <li>3. Where the temporary network utility is within road reserve, the site is reinstated in accordance with conditions specified in the National Code of Practice for Utility Operators' Access to Transport Corridors (15 July 2019);</li> <li>4. The activity complies with relevant standards (NU-S1 - NU-S11);</li> <li>5. The activity complies with standard NU-S12 (Radio Frequency Fields) and standard NU-S13 (Electric and Magnetic Fields), <del>and</del></li> <li><del>6. The activity is not within the National Grid Yard.</del></li> </ol> <p>NU-R11B</p> <p>Activity Status where activity condition 4 is not met: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <p>The relevant matters of discretion for the standard infringed;Where more than one standard will be infringed, the cumulative effects of all infringements considered together, andThe matters set out in policy NU-P4.</p> <p>Notification: Any application under this rule is precluded from</p>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R12: New above ground network utilities within the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and/or River Conservation Zones (that are not regulated by an NES)	Rebecca Eng	99.54	Support	<p>Specific to the National Grid, Rules NU-R6, NU-R7, NU-R12 and NU-R14 all manage the construction of new National Grid assets within the city.</p> <p>Rule 12 relates to new above ground assets within the Estuary Foreshore, Reserve and River Conservation zones. Where the standards are not met, consent is required for a restricted discretionary activity (defaulting to non-complying where the Electric and Magnetic field standard is not met).</p> <p>It is noted that rules R5, R6 and R12 all include the qualifier 'that are not regulated by an NES'. This qualifier does not apply to the National Grid as the NESETA does regulate new National Grid assets.</p> <p>Transpower supports the rules as they provide an appropriate consenting framework in which to consider new National Grid assets. The activity status give effect to the NPSET, specifically Policy 1 and Policy 2.</p>	Retain Rule NU-R12.	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities //	Rebecca Eng	99.73	Amend	Seeks an amendment to the Network Utilities chapter to include a new rule for earthworks within the National Grid Corridor. Earthworks can compromise the National Grid and are anticipated by the NPSET (Policy 10). Earthworks adjacent to support structures can undermine the stability of the structure foundations, causing the structure to lean or, worse, collapse, leading to power outages. Excavations or mounding mid-span can increase risks by reducing the clearance between the ground and conductors. Excavated areas or piles of earthworks can also restrict Transpower's ability to access and locate the heavy machinery required to maintain support structures and conductors around the lines, including in emergency situations. The PDP contains no provisions specific to earthworks in the National Grid Yard, either in the Network Utilities Chapter or in the Earthworks Chapter. It is noted that there is a standard EW-S8 specific to earthworks in proximity of a gas transmission line but no applicable standard for earthworks within proximity of the National Grid. The National Planning Standard definition of earthworks specifically excludes the disturbance of land for the installation of fence posts. For this reason, the rule needs to be amended to expressly regulate fence posts. A permitted rule is sought, defaulting to non-complying where the standards are not complied with.	Insert a new earthworks rule to manage activities within the National Grid yard as follows:  <u>NU – REW Earthworks and vertical holes within the National Grid Yard</u> <u>Activity Status Permitted</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>1. Earthworks and vertical holes do not:</u> <u>a. Exceed 300mm in depth within 6m of the outer visible edge of a National Grid support structure;</u> <u>b. Exceed 3m in depth between 6m and 12m of the outer visible edge of a National Grid support structure;</u> <u>c. Compromise the stability of any National Grid support structures;</u> <u>d. Result in the loss of vehicular access to a National Grid support structure; and</u> <u>e. Result in a reduction of the ground to conductor clearance distances as required in Table 4 of the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001;</u>  <u>2. Earthworks and vertical holes for the following activities are exempt from compliance with EW-RX.1(a) to (d):</u> <u>a. Earthworks or vertical holes, excluding mining and quarrying, that are undertaken by a network utility operator as defined by the Resource Management Act 1991;</u> <u>b. Agricultural or domestic cultivation;</u> <u>c. The repair, sealing or resealing of a vehicle access or farm track, footpath or driveway;</u>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Issues /	Kelby Cai	143.1	Support	Supports the definition for 'network utility' and the provisions which enable the construction of new network utilities as a permitted activity, subject to compliance with various standards, which are generally appropriate for the range of network utilities that oOh supports except NU-S9	To Retain Issues: - NU-I1 - NU-I2 - NU-I3	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /	Kelby Cai	143.2	Support	Supports the definition for 'network utility' and the provisions which enable the construction of new network utilities as a permitted activity, subject to compliance with various standards, which are generally appropriate for the range of network utilities that oOh supports except NU-S9	To retain objectives: - NU-O1 - NU-O2 - NU-O3	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /	Kelby Cai	143.3	Support	Supports the definition for 'network utility' and the provisions which enable the construction of new network utilities as a permitted activity, subject to compliance with various standards, which are generally appropriate for the range of network utilities that oOh supports except NU-S9	To retain policies: - NU-P1 - NU-P2 - NU-P3 - NU-P4	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /	Kelby Cai	143.4	Support	Supports the definition for 'network utility' and the provisions which enable the construction of new network utilities as a permitted activity, subject to compliance with various standards, which are generally appropriate for the range of network utilities that oOh supports except NU-S9	To retain Rules: - NU-R1 - NU-R2 - NU-R5 - NU-R6	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /	Kelby Cai	143.5	Support	Supports the definition for 'network utility' and the provisions which enable the construction of new network utilities as a permitted activity, subject to compliance with various standards, which are generally appropriate for the range of network utilities that oOh supports	To retain Standards: - NU-S1 - NU-S2 - NU-S3 - NU-S4 - NU-S5 - NU-S6 - NU-S7 - NU-S10 - NU-S11	Open Submission



# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S9: Signs	Kelby Cai	143.6	Amend	Supports the definition for 'network utility' and the provisions which enable the construction of new network utilities as a permitted activity, subject to compliance with various standards, which are generally appropriate for the range of network utilities that oOh supports except NU-S9. Standard NU-S9 relates to signs - considers the standard unclear in application only to signs that are directly related to the network utility or whether it applies to other forms of signage.	To amend NU-S9: Sign; to provide for signs directly related to a network utility	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /	Sera Chambers	150.105	Amend	Considers that the wording should be amended to allow adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	Seeks wording to be amended as follows:  <u>The adverse effects of network utilities on the environment are avoided, remedied, or mitigated, as far as practicable, while recognising the functional and operational needs of network utilities (including those associated with their scale, design, and locational requirements).Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.</u>	Open Submission
NU - Network Utilities/Introduction	Tom Anderson	151.21	Support	Considers a cross reference to explain the other regulations which influence some network utilities in the city is appropriate.	Retain this paragraph as notified	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Introduction	Tom Anderson	151.22	Amend	Considers it is not clear how the NU chapter interrelates with the other chapters in the PDP. Under the National Planning Standards, all rules relating to Network Utilities are to be contained in the NU Chapter. This should be made clear to plan users in the introduction to the NU Chapter.	Amend the introduction as follows:  Provisions to manage the effects of other activities on network utilities (including state highway and rail corridors, the electricity distribution network, the National Grid, and gas transmission pipelines) are contained, in the relevant chapters for zones and precincts, special overlays, and district-wide chapters such as the Noise chapter. <u>However, all rules relating to the operation, maintenance, upgrading and construction of new network utilities are contained within this chapter. As such no other chapters in the plan need to be considered for the operation, maintenance, upgrading and construction of new network utilities in Napier City.</u>  A number of network utility operators, including the Napier City Council, also utilise their ability to designate critical sites for a specified network utility purpose. Designations are identified on the Planning Maps and are listed in the 'Designations' section in 'Part 3 - Area-Specific Matters' in the District Plan.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-O1: Essential role of network utilities	Tom Anderson	151.23	Support	This objective is appropriate and is supported.	Retain the objective as notified	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives	Tom Anderson	151.24	Support	Supports objective, particularly as it recognises the practicability of avoiding, remedying and mitigating actual and potential adverse effects, as well as the functional and operational needs of network utilities.	Retain the objective as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives	Tom Anderson	151.25	Support	Supports objective as it is appropriate.	Retain the objective as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P1: Essential role of network utilities	Tom Anderson	151.26	Support	Supports as the policy appropriately recognises the role of network utilities and guides what decision makers should be focussed on when considering resource consent applications	Retain the policy as notified	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /Policies	Tom Anderson	151.27	Amend	Considers that the policy's consideration of adverse effects is narrow, and does not consider the nuance provided in NU-O2 relating to practicability and operational and functional needs.	<p>Amend the policy as follows:</p> <p>Require the development, operation, maintenance, repair, upgrading, and removal of infrastructure to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects <u>as far as practicable</u>, including by:</p> <p>a. avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on:</p> <p>i. natural and physical resources;</p> <p>ii. amenity values, including from shading, visual dominance, noise, vibration, light spill, traffic and access, dust nuisance;</p> <p>iii. the safe and efficient operation of other network utilities, including effects on electricity distribution, electricity transmission and the National Grid, gas transmission pipelines, road and rail networks, and infrastructural service networks, and</p> <p>iv. the health, wellbeing, and safety of people and communities, including by minimising risks from exposure to radiofrequency fields, electric and magnetic fields, and from natural hazards.</p> <p>b. requiring compliance with recognised standards and guidelines for the potential adverse effects of noise, vibration, radiofrequency fields, and electric and magnetic fields.</p> <p>c. encouraging the progressive undergrounding of appropriate network utilities where technically feasible and practicable.</p> <p>d. encouraging the co-siting and sharing of facilities and other innovative solutions.</p> <p>e. encouraging the removal of redundant and superseded above</p>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies	Tom Anderson	151.28	Support	Supports as the policy recognises the functional and operational needs of protected areas and sites of significance.	Retain the policy as notified	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies	Tom Anderson	151.29	Support	Supports as the policy, in particular through subclause (i) appropriately protects telecommunication networks from reverse sensitivity effects. Telecommunications activities can be adversely affected by land use which is too close and too high to mobile phone facilities, essentially building into the radiofrequency plume, and making what was a permitted telecommunications activity a non-complying one. Considers it is imperative therefore that in all zones, reverse sensitivity effects on network utilities must be considered for proposed buildings which exceed the permitted height limit.	Retain the policy as notified	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R1A	Tom Anderson	151.30	Support	Supports as the rule is appropriate for the ongoing operation of existing network utilities	Retain the rule as notified	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R2A	Tom Anderson	151.31	Amend	Considers that the rule appropriately provides for the ongoing operation of existing network utilities however clarification is necessary around what is the 'face area' of an antenna, and a definition is necessary for the work "tower" so that this is clearly understood, including how it is different from a "pole" (noting "pole" is defined in the NES-TF)	Amend the rule as follows: NU-R2A  Activity Status: Permitted Where:  1. The realignment, configuration, relocation, or replacement of electricity, gas distribution, or telecommunication line, pipe, pole, conductors, cross arms, switches, transformers, cabinets, or ancillary structures must be: a. within 5 m of the existing alignment or location. 2. Alterations and additions to overhead electricity and telecommunication lines on existing poles must not: a. increase the number of conductors or wires/lines by more than 100%; b. exceed a diameter of 50 mm, and c. have additional cross arms that exceed the length of the existing cross arm by more than 100%, up to a maximum of 4 m. 3. The diameter of a replacement conductor or line must not exceed the diameter of the replaced conductor or line or 50 mm, whichever is the greater. 4. The addition or replacement of earthwires (either overhead or underground) and underground earthgrids may contain telecommunication lines and earthpeaks or above ground insulators on the poles. 5. Any pole that replaces an existing pole must not:	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R4A	Tom Anderson	151.32	Amend	Supports rule in principle, however it should define what activities are ancillary to the primary function of Hawke's Bay Airport so that it is clear in the rule.	Amend the rule to detail what activities are considered ancillary to the primary function of Hawke's Bay Airport	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R6A	Tom Anderson	151.33	Support	Supports as the rule is clear for all network utility construction. An elevation to Restricted Discretionary is appropriate.	Retain the rule as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R11A	Tom Anderson	151.34	Amend	Supports permitted provision for temporary network utilities however, temporary network utilities give rise to temporary effects. Subclause (4) requires compliance with all network utility standards. This means there is no additional benefit to a temporary facility over and above a permanent one in the same location. Considers that while it is appropriate that some network utility standards are met, it is not essential for all standards to be met.	Amend the rule as follows: NU-R11A  Activity Status: Permitted  Where:  1. The activity operates for a maximum of 12 months; 2. The temporary network utility and associated buildings and structures are removed from the site when the operation of the activity ceases; 3. Where the temporary network utility is within road reserve, the site is reinstated in accordance with conditions specified in the National Code of Practice for Utility Operators' Access to Transport Corridors (15 July 2019); 4. The activity complies with relevant standards (NU-S1 - NU-S11) NU-S5, NU-S6, NU-S7, ; 5. <del>The activity complies with standard NU-S12 (Radio Frequency Fields) and standard NU-S13 (Electric and Magnetic Fields), and</del> 6. The activity is not within the National Grid Yard.  NU-R11B  Activity Status where activity condition 4 is not met: Restricted Discretionary	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R12A	Tom Anderson	151.35	Oppose	Opposes as controlled Activity status in more sensitive zones can be appropriate however, in reviewing the PDP, the zones listed do not appear to exist. As such the rule should be deleted.	Delete the rule as notified	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table	Tom Anderson	151.36	Amend	Notes that under the NESTF, there is no setback required for a telecommunication structure located in legal road where that road adjoins a railway line. Considers that it would be appropriate to have the same provision for other network utility structures, otherwise structures with the same effect are permitted or restricted discretionary in the same location depending on who the network utility operator is.	<p>Amend the standard as follows:</p> <p>Where adjoining the rail corridor boundary</p> <p>Purpose: to avoid, remedy, or mitigate effects on public health and safety and the functioning of the rail corridor.</p> <p>1. The following minimum setbacks for network utilities from the rail corridor boundary must be provided as follows:</p> <p>a. any part of an above ground building or structure - 2 m <u>nil (where located within road reserve).</u></p> <p>Refer to assessment criteria NU-AC1.</p>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S12: Radio frequency fields	Tom Anderson	151.37	Amend	Considers that the standard is inconsistent with current best practice for radiofrequency, detailed in the NES-TF, and as such should be updated. Notes that NZS2772.1 details measurement points, methods and these are well understood and used everyday by the telecommunications industry.	<p>Amend the standard as follows</p> <p>NU-S12: Radio frequency fields All zones and associated precincts</p> <p>Purpose: to protect public health and safety and ensure the generation of radiofrequency fields is maintained at an acceptable level of public exposure.</p> <p>1. If generating radiofrequency fields, the activity must <del>not exceed the maximum exposure level of the general public in be installed and operated in accordance with</del> New Zealand Standard NZS 2772.1:1999 Radiofrequency fields – Maximum exposure levels – 3 kHz to 300 GHz at: <del>any point beyond the site boundary and less than 5 m in height above ground level where the land is not occupied by a building, and any point beyond the site boundary and less than 2 m above a building, roof, or balcony on any land beyond the site boundary.</del></p> <p><del>Subject to the express provisions of this condition, the maximum general public exposure levels must be measured in accordance with New Zealand Standard NZS6609:1990 (Part 2 Principles and Methods of Measurement).</del></p>	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S3: Height for above ground structures (other than buildings)	Tom Anderson	151.38	Amend	<p>Notes that Mobile telecommunication facilities rely on line of sight for optimal function. Increased antenna height improves coverage by surpassing local 'clutter' such as buildings and trees. Considers that as well as these provisions affecting potential future sites, they also create a potential reverse sensitivity effect on existing sites. Proposed building height provisions in the PDP may obstruct mobile telecommunication facilities. Notes that greater building height alters radiofrequency exposures, necessitating compliance with safety standards as it potentially allows people to be exposed to greater levels of radiofrequency, and changes the activity status of an existing or permitted facility from permitted to non-complying under the NESTF. Support city densification but highlight the need to upgrade existing networks with provision in the PDP. Considers the inclusion of The need for increased mobile telecommunication facility heights as part of the densification of cities in New Zealand is recognised in the recently released Targeted engagement draft - Natural and Built Environment (Transitional National Planning Framework) Regulations from the Ministry for the Environment, which in its final form will be utilised in plans made under the Natural and Built Environment Act 2023. In relation to mobile telecommunication facility heights, draft Regulation 13.2.33 proposes a height of 17m in areas zoned for residential and local centre activities, 20m in areas zoned for neighbourhood centre activities, and 25m in other zones. These heights are generally supported.</p> <p>Considers an alternative approach suggests allowing mobile facility heights 5m taller than permitted building heights which mitigates clutter and radiofrequency effects as those adopted in New Plymouth and similar considerations are under review in other districts PDPs, including</p>	<p>Delete the standard and replace:</p> <p><u>Pole heights</u></p> <p><u>1. In Legal Road</u></p> <p><u>a. Maximum permitted height adjoining residential zones (excluding medium or high-density residential zones) is zone building height plus 5 metres or 17m whichever is the larger</u></p> <p><u>b. Maximum permitted height adjoining all medium or high-density residential zones is zone building height plus 5 metres</u></p> <p><u>c. Maximum permitted height of 20 metres adjoining a local centre or neighbourhood zone; or</u></p> <p><u>d. Maximum permitted height of 35 metres adjoining Rural zones;</u></p> <p><u>or</u></p> <p><u>e. Maximum permitted height of 17 metres adjoining areas</u></p> <p><u>f. Adjoining all other zones maximum permitted height is the greater of either 25 metres or the relevant building height for the adjoining zone, plus 5 metres.</u></p> <p><u>2. Maximum height in Residential zones is 17m or 5m plus zone building height which ever is the greater.</u></p> <p><u>3. Maximum height in local centre zones is 20m with a setback of 3m plus 450 if adjoining a residential zone</u></p> <p><u>4. Maximum of 25m in all other commercial, industrial, recreational, hospital zones or the zone building height, plus 5 metres whichever is greater</u></p> <p><u>5. Maximum of 35m in rural zones or 40m if there are two or more operators on the facility.</u></p>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /All zones and associated precincts	Tom Anderson	151.39	Amend	<p>Notes that there appears to be a typo in the standard for panel antenna size. 20m2 as permitted is generous. 2.5m2 is more appropriate. 1.5m2 in other zones provides better alignment with the NESTF. clarification should be provided for which face of a panel antenna the standards apply to.</p>	<p>Amend the standard as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>4. Panel <u>antennas</u> must not:</p> <p>a. exceed 2.0 m2 in <u>front face</u> area any commercial and mixed use zones, industrial zones, or airport zones and associated precincts;</p> <p>b. exceed 1.25 m2 <u>frontface area</u> in all other zones, and</p> <p>c. ...</p>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /All zones and associated precincts	Tom Anderson	151.40	Support	<p>Supports as telecommunication companies will put up signs explaining they have provided a new service to an area. The standard as notified is appropriate for this purpose.</p>	<p>Retain the standard as notified.</p>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /	Tom Anderson	151.44	Amend	<p>Seeks a new rule in order to ensure that customer connections to heritage buildings are permitted. Considers that new customer connections provide for the adaptive reuse of buildings, and by having appropriate permitted activity standards, adverse effects on the heritage item can be avoided, remedied or mitigated.</p>	<p>Add a new rule as follows:</p> <p><u>NU-RX Customer connections to a heritage building</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status: Permitted</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>Customer connections to heritage buildings where the customer connection shall not be attached to a primary feature or front façade of the heritage building or item.</u></p> <p><u>Activity status where not achieved: Discretionary</u></p>	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /Assessment Criteria	Tom Anderson	151.45	Amend	Considers that the objective and policy framework recognises functional need and operational need. The assessment criteria should follow suit.	Amend the assessment criteria as follows:  a. Whether the increased height of the building or structure will cause shading or visual dominance and/or adversely affect the character and visual amenity of adjoining properties and within the existing streetscape and road frontage. b. Whether the network utility utilises an existing building or structure. As far as practicable, network utilities should co-site and share facilities. c. Whether the health and safety of surrounding properties and occupiers will be maintained through the building or structure being located at an adequate distance from all property boundaries. d. Whether the building or structure will be temporary in nature. e. Whether the proposed building or structure will penetrate into any of the flight paths of the Hawke's Bay airport. <u>f. Whether there are any characteristics, technical requirements, functional needs or operational needs of the proposed use that will make compliance impracticable</u>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Introduction /	Tom Anderson	151.71	Amend	Strongly supports this introductory wording "it is considered appropriate that a single set of rules be provided that apply across the District". Considers that, to follow the method of other recently notified plans and to provide further clarification, additional wording is proposed which makes it clear that only the NU chapter is applicable to network utility activities.	Amend the introduction as follows:  To achieve this, the network utility provisions in the District Plan provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of network utilities throughout the district while managing their adverse effects on the environment (particularly in sensitive environments such as the coastal environment, outstanding and significant landscapes, significant natural areas, areas containing cultural or historic heritage values, and areas subject to natural hazards). As many network utilities are lineal and traverse many parts of the district, it is considered appropriate that a single set of rules be provided that apply across the District. <u>Therefore there is no requirement for activities defined as network utilities to consider the provisiosn of the district-wide chapters relevant for Hazards and Risks, Historical and Cultural Values, Natural Environmental Values, or the zone chapters.</u>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R12A	Tom Anderson	151.80	Amend	Considers the addition of lines to existing overhead networks in these zones should be provided for as a permitted activity.	Amend the rule so that the addition of new lines to any existing overhead networks in these zones is a permitted activity	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R12A	Tom Anderson	151.81	Amend	Considers that the functional need or operational need of infrastructure should be a consideration under the matters of discretion.	Amend the provision as follows:  NU-R12B  Activity Status where activity conditions 1 or 2 are not met: Restricted Discretionary  Matters of discretion are:  1. The <u>effects</u> on the amenity of the area and its surrounds; 2. The <u>effects</u> on any cultural, historical, amenity, recreational, and/or ecological values the area may possess, and 3. The <u>effects</u> on any outstanding natural feature or significant landscape identified in the District Plan. 4. <u>The functional need or operational need for infrastructure to be located in the zone</u>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /All zones and associated precincts	Tom Anderson	151.82	Amend	Considers that the standard should recognise that the telecommunication companies have experience in constructing pole structures beneath airport obstacle limitation surfaces and through this experience it has been found that engineers are equally capable of calculating maximum permitted height without penetrating the surfaces.	Amend the provision as follows:  All zones and associated precincts  .... Note: A registered surveyor's certificate or <u>engineering calculation</u> verifying that the building or structure plans meet the Airport Height Control Designation in Appendix 1 will be required at the time of applying for building consent or requesting a certificate of compliance. ... ...	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /All zones and associated precincts	Tom Anderson	151.83	Oppose	Opposes as there is no requirement for this standard - there are other existing processes through Corridor Access Requests and the Resource Management (Network Utility Operations) Regulations 2016 which require the same matter to be considered.	Delete the provision.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /All zones and associated precincts	Tom Anderson	151.84	Amend	Considers that the standard needs to be reworded to an activity which has a footprint of more than 200m2 in area, rather than on a site of that size. Often small infrastructure such as a pole or a cabinet which has no transport implications can be located on a site which is more than 200m2 in area.	Amend the provision as follows:  All zones and associated precincts  ... 1. Any network utility <del>on a site that is</del> that has a footprint of more than 200 m2 in area, must meet the requirements for access in the Transport chapter in standards, TPT-S4 (Vehicle Access (General)), TPT-S5 (Vehicle Access (Restrictions)), and TPT-S6 (Manoeuvring).	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /All zones and associated precincts	Tom Anderson	151.85	Amend	Considers some clarification is sought in the wording, so that new lines over a waterway attached to existing structures, such as poles, are clearly provided for.	Amend the provision as follows:  ... 3. When located above a waterbody, new pipes, cables, conductors, or lines must be: a. attached to an existing bridge or structure and <del>incorporated within an existing bridge structure or culvert,</del> or b. within an existing attached conduit or duct. ...	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /	Tom Anderson	151.86	Amend	Considers a new rule is needed to ensure that monitoring equipment in the Coastal Environment or on the surface of water is permitted. Such equipment is beneficial to understanding changes to the environment which surrounds us.	Add a new rule with permitted activity status for new monitoring equipment on the surface of water or in the coastal environment.	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S4: Floor space & dimensionsAll zones and associated precincts	Tom Anderson	151.87	Amend	Notes that the standard is about dimensions - having floor space in the title is somewhat confusing as the standard is much broader. Considers that the floor space for buildings is limited, and should reflect the underlying site coverage of buildings in the relevant zone that the building is located in. The Antenna sizes provided for should align with the NESTF.	<p>Amend the standard as follows:</p> <p>NU-S4: <del>Floor space &amp;</del> dimensions</p> <p>...</p> <p>1. Any above ground building or structure (excluding new electric vehicle charging facilities) must not:</p> <p>a. exceed 10 m2 gross floor area (where located within road reserve);</p> <p>b. <del>exceed 15 m2 gross floor area (where located outside road reserve) in the</del><u>insert site coverage permitted standards in</u> residential zones and associated precincts, and</p> <p>c. <del>exceed 50 m2 gross floor area (where located outside road reserve) in the rural zones (including rural lifestyle zone), commercial and mixed use zones, industrial zones and associated precincts</del> <u>insert site coverage permitted standards in</u>.</p> <p>...</p> <p>4. Panel antennas must not:</p> <p>a. exceed <del>20</del> 2.5m2 in <u>front face area</u> in any commercial and mixed use zones, industrial zones, or airport zones and associated precincts;</p> <p>b. exceed 1.25 m2 in <u>front face area in</u> all other zones, and</p> <p>c. when located within road reserve, must fit within an envelope of 3.5 m in length and 0.7m in width.</p> <p>...</p>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-O2: Adverse effects of network utilities	Tom Anderson	151.88	Amend	Considers that the functional need and operational need are two separately defined terms, and the objective should recognise that only one or the other is required to be satisfied to fulfil the objective, not both.	<p>Amend the provision as follows</p> <p><u>NU-O2: Adverse effects of network utilities</u></p> <p><u>The adverse effects of network utilities on the environment are avoided, remedied, or mitigated, as far as is practicable, while recognising the functional <del>and</del> or operational needs of network utilities (including those associated with their scale, design, and locational requirements).</u></p> <p>- <u>Relates to NU-I2</u></p>	Open Submission



# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /	Tom Anderson	151.89	Amend	Considers that clear provision should be provided for activities which are regulated by, but do not meet the relevant permitted regulations of the NESTF but do not have significant adverse effects. It is appropriate for such structures to have Controlled Activity Status.	<p>Add a new rule as follows:</p> <p><u>NU-RX: Telecommunications regulated under NES-TF, but which do not meet the permitted activity standards in Regulations 27, 29, 31, 33 or 35 of the NESTF</u></p> <p><u>All Zones</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status: CON</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>1. for panel antenna a width of 0.8m is not exceeded;</u>  <u>2. for dish antenna, the antenna does not exceed a diameter of:</u>  <u>a. 1.2m in a residential zone; or</u>  <u>b. 3m in all other zones.</u></p> <p><u>And the activity complies with the following standards:</u>  <u>NU-S3 and INF-S12</u></p> <p><u>Matters over which control are reserved:</u>  <u>NU-AC3</u></p> <p><u>Activity status when compliance is not achieved with RXX.1 – XX.2</u>  <u>RDIS</u></p>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-O1: Essential role of network utilities	Sheena McGuire	168.26	Support	Supports recognition of the essential role of network utilities and the intent of the objective to enable the safety and efficiency of network utilities, including the rail network.	Retain as proposed	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-O2: Adverse effects of network utilities	Sheena McGuire	168.27	Support	Supports recognition of the functional and operational needs of network utilities while managing adverse effects on the environment.	Retain as proposed	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-O3: Adverse effects on network utilities	Sheena McGuire	168.28	Support	Supports the intent of this objective, to protect the operation, safety, maintenance, upgrade and development of network utilities from incompatible activities and reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain as proposed	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P1: Essential role of network utilities	Sheena McGuire	168.29	Support	Supports provisions which enable and provide for the on-going operation and maintenance of existing network utilities, as well as providing for upgrade and development of new network utilities.	Retain as proposed	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P2: Adverse effects of network utilities	Sheena McGuire	168.30	Support	Supports policy direction that recognises that it is not always possible to avoid adverse effects of infrastructure and that adverse effects on the safety and efficiency of network utilities must be managed.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P3: Adverse effects of network utilities on protected areas and sites of significance	Sheena McGuire	168.31	Support	Supports management of adverse effects of network utilities on protected areas and sites of significance while recognising the functional and operational needs of network utilities.	Retain as proposed	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P4: Adverse effects on network utilities	Sheena McGuire	168.32	Amend	Supports provisions that seek to protect the safe and efficient operation, maintenance, upgrade and development of the rail corridor. Supports clauses (a)-(c) which specifically seek to protect the corridor via managing setbacks, noise sensitive activities and access. Seeks a new clause to ensure that land disturbance and subdivision are managed within the vicinity of the rail corridor as well as activities to address all potential impacts from adjacent development and land uses.	Amend as follows: a. managing new activities through setbacks and design controls, where necessary, to achieve appropriate protection of a network utility; b. managing new activities that are sensitive to noise adjoining the railway corridor; c. managing access to the railway corridor and to the national, regional, and arterial road network; d. managing light spill and glare from activities on road users and aircraft; e. avoiding physical obstructions within the Airport Zone; f. managing land disturbance and activities in the vicinity of electricity distribution infrastructure including cables, poles, and substations, and maintaining safe electrical clearance distances under electricity distribution lines and support structures; g. ensuring that land disturbance, subdivision, and activities within the National Grid Yard, the National Grid Subdivision Corridor, or within the vicinity of a designated National Grid substation that may compromise the National Grid; h. maintaining safe electrical clearance distances under electricity distribution lines and support structures, and i. ensuring subdivision of sites containing a network utility can achieve safe clearance distances and retain the ability for the network utility operator to access, operate, maintain, repair, and upgrade the network utility. j. <u>managing land disturbance, subdivision, and activities in the</u>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R1: Operation, maintenance, replacement, and removal of existing network utilities (that are not regulated by an NES) in all zones and precincts	Sheena McGuire	168.33	Support	Supports the Permitted Activity status of the operation, maintenance, replacement, and removal of existing network utilities in all zones and precincts subject to compliance with standards. Supports a Restricted Discretionary Activity status noting matter of discretion 3. in particular, where compliance with standards cannot be achieved	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R2: Minor upgrading of existing network utilities in all zones and precincts	Sheena McGuire	168.34	Amend	Supports the Permitted Activity status of minor upgrading of existing network utilities. Considers the clauses fail to provide for rail infrastructure minor upgrades. Seeks amendment to ensure minor upgrades to rail infrastructure can be carried out as a permitted activity, subject to standards. Seeks amendment to NU-R2B to ensure the potential adverse effects on the safe and efficient operation of the rail network.	Amend as follows: NU-R2A Activity Status: Permitted Where: The realignment, configuration, relocation, or replacement of electricity, gas distribution, or telecommunication line, pipe, pole, conductors, cross arms, switches, transformers, cabinets, <u>rail infrastructure</u> or ancillary structures must be: a. within 5 m of the existing alignment or location. NU-R2B Activity Status where activity conditions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 or 11 are not met: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are: a. Functional and operational needs of and benefits derived from the network utility; b. Purposes and necessity of the upgrading; c. Potential adverse visual effects of the upgrading, including impacts on the amenity values of the locality and any contribution	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R6: Construction of new network utilities (that are not regulated by an NES) not already provided for in NU-R4 (within the Airport Zone) and NU-R5 (within National Grid Yard) in all zones and precincts, except the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and/or River Conservation Zones	Sheena McGuire	168.35	Amend	Considers that it is unclear where the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and River Conservation Zones are. There is one zone labelled 'Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology' but otherwise it's unclear where the other listed zones are. Seeks clarification of these zones within relevant provisions and on the planning maps. Considers it is difficult to assess the appropriateness of these provisions for construction of new network utilities without confirming how these zones interact with the rail corridor.	Amend as follows:  Amend planning maps to clearly show the extent of the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and River Conservation Zones.  And/or  Amend provisions to correctly list defined precincts/zones on the planning maps.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R7: Construction of new underground network utilities in the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and/or River Conservation Zones	Sheena McGuire	168.36	Amend	Considers that it is unclear where the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and River Conservation Zones are. There is one zone labelled 'Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology' but otherwise it's unclear where the other listed zones are. Seeks clarification of these zones within relevant provisions and on the planning maps.Considers it is difficult to assess the appropriateness of these provisions for construction of new network utilities without confirming how these zones interact with the rail corridor.	Amend as follows:  Amend planning maps to clearly show the extent of the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and River Conservation Zones.  And/orAmend provisions to correctly list defined precincts/zones on the planning maps.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R12: New above ground network utilities within the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and/or River Conservation Zones (that are not regulated by an NES)	Sheena McGuire	168.37	Amend	Considers that it is unclear where the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and River Conservation Zones are. There is one zone labelled 'Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology' but otherwise it's unclear where the other listed zones are. Seeks clarification of these zones within relevant provisions and on the planning maps. Considers it is difficult to assess the appropriateness of these provisions for construction of new network utilities without confirming how these zones interact with the rail corridor.	Amend as follows:  Amend planning maps to clearly show the extent of the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and River Conservation Zones.  And/orAmend provisions to correctly list defined precincts/zones on the planning maps.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R11: Temporary network utilities in all zones and precincts	Sheena McGuire	168.38	Support	Supports provision for temporary network utilities in all zones and precincts as a Permitted Activity, subject to standards.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S1: Setbacks	Sheena McGuire	168.39	Amend	Supports the proposed setbacks for network utilities including rail buildings and structures on sites adjoining residential activities and non- residential activities. Seeks amendment to 3. Setbacks where adjoining the rail corridor. Considers that a safety setback is important to provide enough space within a site adjoining the rail corridor for the network utility operator of that building, line or structure to maintain and access their network utility – without accessing the rail corridor to do so, or getting too close to trains. Considers that network utilities constructed close to the rail corridor do not leave enough space on site for essential maintenance activities and the lack of space means that it is highly likely that these activities can only happen by accessing the rail corridor. Notes the rail corridor is not a public domain and it has a very different and high consequence risk profile compared to entering other sites. Notes it is a hazardous environment and entering the rail corridor can result in a material safety issue to both the person accessing the corridor, and to the rail operations being undertaken within the rail corridor. Seeks a 5 metre safety setback from the boundary of the rail corridor to provide sufficient clearance to use and maintain network utilities safely while ensuring the provision of a safe and efficient rail network.	Amend as follows:  The following minimum setbacks for network utilities from the rail corridor boundary must be provided as follows:  any part of an above ground building or structure - <del>2</del> 5m.	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S2: Height for above ground buildings	Sheena McGuire	168.40	Amend	Generally supports the height standards for above ground buildings. Seeks minor amendment to the matters of discretion for consistency and to ensure the efficiency of network utilities is a consideration.	Amend as follows:  Matters of discretion are:  1. Functional and operational requirements of the network utility; 2. Effects on character and amenity of adjoining sites and surrounding environment; 3. The prominence of the location, taking into account significant public views; 4. Effects on public health and safety, including air traffic safety, <u>5. Impact on the safe and efficient operation of the network utility; and</u> 6. Impacts on the functional requirements, and safe and efficient operation of other network utilities.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S3: Height for above ground structures (other than buildings)	Sheena McGuire	168.41	Amend	Generally supports the height standards for above ground structures. Seeks minor amendment to the matters of discretion for consistency and to ensure the safe and efficient operation of network utilities is a consideration.	Amend as follows:  Matters of discretion are:  1. Functional and operational requirements of the network utility; 2. Effects on character and amenity of adjoining sites and surrounding environment; 3. The prominence of the location, taking into account significant public views; 4. Effects on public health and safety, including air traffic safety, <u>5. Impact on the safe and efficient operation of the network utility; and</u> 6. Impacts on the functional requirements, and safe <u>and efficient</u> operation of other network utilities.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S4: Floor space & dimensions	Sheena McGuire	168.42	Amend	Generally supports the floor space standards for above ground buildings and structures. Seeks minor amendment to the matters of discretion for consistency and to ensure the safe and efficient operation of network utilities is a consideration.	Matters of discretion are:  1. Functional and operational requirements of the network utility; 2. Effects on character and amenity of adjoining sites and surrounding environment; 3. The prominence of the location, taking into account significant public views, and <u>4. Impact on the safe and efficient operation of the network utility;</u> 5. Effects on public health and safety.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S5: Sight distances	Sheena McGuire	168.43	Amend	Notes that this standard currently only refers to state highway sight distances. Requests amendment to ensure that both rail and road intersection sightlines are protected for safety reasons. Requests inclusion of a new rule and standard within the Transport Chapter to require protection of level crossing sight lines. Requests amendment to NU-S5 to refer to these provisions and ensure compliance for network utilities.	Amend as follows:  ...  <u>3. Any network utility must meet the requirements of TPT-R6 and TPT-S8 relating to the protection of sight lines at railway level crossings.</u>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S6: Noise and vibration	Sheena McGuire	168.44	Amend	Supports clause 2. which specifies that noise limits don't apply to emergency and back-up generator noise for 48 hours. Seeks inclusion of new matters of discretion for consistency and to ensure the safe and efficient operation of network utilities is a consideration.	Matters of discretion are:  <u>1. Functional and operational requirements of the network utility;</u> <u>2. Effects on character and amenity of adjoining sites and surrounding environment;</u> <u>3. Impact on the safe and efficient operation of the network utility;</u> 4. Effects of noise on amenity values, and 5. Effects on public health and safety.	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S7: Light spill	Sheena McGuire	168.45	Amend	Supports a specific light spill standard for network utilities. KiwiRail is required to install and use lighting for safe navigation and access within the rail corridor. Requests that the rail lighting is grouped with road lighting.	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For sites adjoining or adjacent to residentially zoned land, the following standard shall apply, except where the light source is located on a legal road, road reserve or service lane, <u>or within the rail corridor</u>: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>all external lighting must be sited, directed, and screened to ensure that the direct illuminance from the lighting installation must be less than 8 lux spill measured at a height of 1.5 m above the ground at the boundary of the site.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Where any network utility is located on a road <u>or within the rail corridor</u>, any outdoor lighting must be so selected, located aimed, adjusted, screened and maintained to ensure that glare resulting from the lighting does not cause significant adverse effects on the occupants of residential activities, road users, or aircraft.</li> <li>The above light spill standards do not apply to road lighting, traffic signals, rail lighting, and navigational beacons.</li> </ol> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Functional and operational requirements of the network utility;</u></li> <li><u>Impact on the safe and efficient operation of the network utility;</u></li> <li>Effects of light spill and glare on residential amenity values, and</li> <li>Effects on road user and aircraft safety.</li> </ol>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S8: Parking and access	Sheena McGuire	168.46	Amend	Seeks amendment to ensure that vehicle access tracks, required for regular maintenance of the rail network, are not included in this standard. The rail corridor could be considered to be over 200m2 however the submitter does not consider it is the intention of this standard to capture access tracks for linear infrastructure.	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any network utility on a site that is more than 200m2 in area, <u>excluding the rail network</u>, must meet the requirements for access in the Transport chapter in standards, TPT-S4 (Vehicle Access (General)), TPT-S5 (Vehicle Access (Restrictions)), and TPT-S6 (Manoeuvring).</li> </ol>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-O1: Essential role of network utilities	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.18	Amend	Powerco supports the intent of this objective, however it is lacking clarity as to what it is trying to achieve. Issue NU-I1 states that adequate provision of network utilities is vital – as such, adding the words ‘are enabled’ is appropriate.	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>NU-O1: Essential role of network utilities</p> <p>Safe, effective, efficient, and resilient network utilities throughout the city, that provide essential integrated and secure services <u>are enabled</u>, including in emergencies, and enable people and communities to provide for their health, safety, and wellbeing.</p>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-O2: Adverse effects of network utilities	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.19	Support	Powerco supports this objective and the clarity which it provides.	Retain as drafted	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-O3: Adverse effects on network utilities	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.20	Support	Powerco supports this objective and the clarity which it provides.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P1: Essential role of network utilities	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.21	Support	Powerco supports this policy and the clarity which it provides.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P2: Adverse effects of network utilities	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.22	Amend	Powerco is concerned that the broad inclusion of amenity values in this policy will become problematic for network utilities as this term is very subjective.	Amend as follows:  NU-P2: Adverse effects of network utilities  Require the development, operation, maintenance, repair, upgrading, and removal of infrastructure to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects, including by:  a. avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on:  i. natural and physical resources; ii. <del>amenity values, including from</del> shading, visual dominance, noise, vibration, light spill, traffic and access, dust nuisance; ...	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P3: Adverse effects of network utilities on protected areas and sites of significance	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.23	Support	Powerco supports this policy and the clarity which it provides.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P4: Adverse effects on network utilities	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.24	Support	Powerco supports this policy and the clarity which it provides.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.25	Amend	Powerco believes that it would be beneficial to insert a statement before the start of the NU rules table to clarify what other plan provisions apply to network utilities with clear cross referencing (Similar to the Earthworks Chapter Activity Table).	Seeks to add the following text before the NU rules table: <u>As this chapter contains district-wide provisions relating to Network Utilities, the rules and standards in the zone chapters do not apply to Network Utilities (unless otherwise specified).</u>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R1: Operation, maintenance, replacement, and removal of existing network utilities (that are not regulated by an NES) in all zones and precincts	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.26	Support	Powerco supports this rule as existing network utilities need to be operated, maintained, replaced and removed as required.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R2: Minor upgrading of existing network utilities in all zones and precincts	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.27	Amend	Powerco is concerned at the requirement in NU-R2A.1 for upgrades to be within 5m of the existing alignment or location. Sometimes assets need to be relocated beyond 5m to avoid other network utilities, unsuitable ground conditions or sensitive environments. Moving an underground asset by more than 5m shouldn't trigger the need for a resource consent. Powerco is also of the view NU-R2A.3 needs to be clarified to ensure it is not incorrectly applied to underground pipelines. Powerco supports the inclusion of NU-R2A.9.	Amend as follows:  Activity Status: Permitted  Where:  <del>1. The realignment, configuration, relocation, or replacement of electricity, gas distribution, or telecommunication line, pipe, pole, conductors, cross arms, switches, transformers, cabinets, or ancillary structures must be:</del>  <del>within 5 m of the existing alignment or location.</del> 2. ....  3. The diameter of a replacement conductor or <u>telecommunication</u> line must not exceed the diameter of the replaced conductor or <u>telecommunication</u> line or 50 mm, whichever is the greater.  .....  Retain NU-R2A.9 as drafted	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R4: Construction of new network utilities and upgrading of existing network utilities (that are not regulated by an NES) within the Airport Zone (but not within the state highway)	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.28	Support	Powerco supports this rule - it is appropriate that new network utilities are constructed and existing assets are upgraded as required within the Airport Zone.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R5: Construction of new network utilities and upgrading of existing network utilities (that are not regulated by an NES) within the National Grid Yard (other than for the reticulation and storage of water for irrigation purposes carried out by a network utility operator) in all zones and precincts	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.29	Support	Powerco supports this rule - it is appropriate that new network utilities are constructed and existing assets are upgraded as required within the National Grid Yard.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R6: Construction of new network utilities (that are not regulated by an NES) not already provided for in NU-R4 (within the Airport Zone) and NU-R5 (within National Grid Yard) in all zones and precincts, except the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and/or River Conservation Zones	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.30	Support	Powerco supports this rule - it is appropriate that construction of new network utilities are provided for.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R7: Construction of new underground network utilities in the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and/or River Conservation Zones	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.31	Support	Powerco supports this rule - it is appropriate that construction of new underground network utilities are provided for in these zones.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R11: Temporary network utilities in all zones and precincts	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.32	Support	Powerco supports this rule - it is appropriate that temporary network utilities are provided for.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R12: New above ground network utilities within the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and/or River Conservation Zones (that are not regulated by an NES)	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.33	Support	Powerco supports this rule - it is appropriate that new network utilities located within these zones are provided for as controlled activities.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R13: Buildings or structures within the National Grid Yard in all zones	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.34	Oppose	Powerco is concerned that this rule effectively erodes the intent of rule NU-R5 as it applies to all 'structures' which has a very wide definition (and therefore would capture all network utility structures). It seems this rule should be located within the respective zone rules, not in the NU chapter.	Either delete the rule in its entirety or move it to the respective zone rules.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S1: SetbacksWhere adjoining residential activities	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.35	Support	Powerco supports this standard - it is appropriate that no setbacks apply to network utilities in the road.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S1: Setbacks	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.36	Support	Powerco supports this standard - it is appropriate that no setbacks apply to network utilities in the road.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S1: Setbacks	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.37	Amend	Powerco is concerned that this standard could apply in situations where a road runs parallel to a rail corridor – and road corridor managers often require network utilities to be placed in close proximity to the road boundary (i.e. within 2m of the rail corridor).	Amend as follows: NU-S1: Setbacks Where adjoining the rail corridor boundary Purpose: to avoid, remedy, or mitigate effects on public health and safety and the functioning of the rail corridor. 1. The following minimum setbacks for network utilities from the rail corridor boundary must be provided as follows: a. any part of an above ground building or structure - 2 m. b. any part of an above ground structure located in road (including the road reserve) - nil.	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S2: Height for above ground buildings	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.38	Amend	This standard is intended to apply to buildings, not structures which are covered in NU-S3. For clarity it is suggested that the word 'structure' in this standard is deleted.	Amend as follows:  NU-S2: Height for above ground buildings  All zones and associated precincts  Purpose: to avoid, remedy, or mitigate effects of buildings on amenity, particularly in terms of visual effects and shading and effects on air traffic safety.  1. Any part of an above ground building of a network utility <del>structure</del> must not exceed the maximum permitted height stated in the condition table for the respective zone or the Airport Height Control Designation in Appendix 1. 2. ....	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S3: Height for above ground structures (other than buildings)	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.39	Support	Powerco supports this standard – the height for structures as contained within this standard is appropriate	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S4: Floor space & dimensions	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.40	Support	Powerco supports this standard – the gross floor areas are appropriate for the specified zones.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S9: Signs	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.41	Support	Powerco supports this standard – the signage standards are appropriate.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S10: Pipelines, cables, conductors, and lines	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.42	Support	Powerco supports this standard – the requirements applying to pipelines are appropriate.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S11: Removal of derelict above ground network utilities	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.43	Support	Powerco supports this standard – the removal of derelict above ground structures (only) is considered generally appropriate.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Introduction	Ellen Robotham	198.31	Amend	Considers the introduction should recognise the Airport as a network utility, as per the definition of network utility operator under section 166 of the RMA. However, an exemption needs to be applied within this chapter which clarifies that the rules within the NU chapter do not apply to Airport Activities within the Airport Zone.	Amend the introduction to include reference to Hawke's Bay Airport as a network utility, as follows:  Network utilities are physical resources that include road and rail networks, cycleway and walkway networks, <u>airports</u> , telecommunication networks, radio communication facilities, electricity and gas transmission and distribution networks, infrastructure service networks such as reticulated water, sewerage, trade waste and stormwater drainage networks, and ancillary activities including associated buildings, structures, equipment and customer connections .....  <u>The methods within the NU chapter do not apply to Airport Activities undertaken in the Airport Zone. Such activities are managed under the Airport Zone chapter.</u>	Open Submission



## NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-01: Essential role of network utilities	Ellen Robotham	198.32	Support	<p>HBAL is a lifeline utility under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002. Cyclone Gabrielle highlighted the essential role of HBAL as a Lifeline Utility, with flood waters obstructing and causing significant damage to land transport networks. The Airport became the base for search and rescue teams, the link to the outside, source of generators, communications etc. This further emphasises why it is important to appropriately recognise and provide for the ongoing operation and development of Hawke's Bay Airport and the need for more robust access to the airport terminal and greater provision of apron space. Generally support the intent of this chapter and provisions which appropriately recognise the essential role of network utilities and enable the ongoing operation and development of network utilities, however Airport Activities within the Airport Zone should be managed through the designation and zone chapters, rather than the NU rules. An exclusion to this effect should therefore be included within the NU chapter.</p> <p>It is appropriate to limit the exclusion to Airport Activities within the Airport Zone only, as some airport activities occur beyond the Airport Zone (such as weather stations and navigational aids).</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-02: Adverse effects of network utilities	Ellen Robotham	198.33	Support	<p>HBAL is a lifeline utility under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002. Cyclone Gabrielle highlighted the essential role of HBAL as a Lifeline Utility, with flood waters obstructing and causing significant damage to land transport networks. The Airport became the base for search and rescue teams, the link to the outside, source of generators, communications etc. This further emphasises why it is important to appropriately recognise and provide for the ongoing operation and development of Hawke's Bay Airport and the need for more robust access to the airport terminal and greater provision of apron space. Generally support the intent of this chapter and provisions which appropriately recognise the essential role of network utilities and enable the ongoing operation and development of network utilities, however Airport Activities within the Airport Zone should be managed through the designation and zone chapters, rather than the NU rules. An exclusion to this effect should therefore be included within the NU chapter.</p> <p>It is appropriate to limit the exclusion to Airport Activities within the Airport Zone only, as some airport activities occur beyond the Airport Zone (such as weather stations and navigational aids).</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-03: Adverse effects on network utilities	Ellen Robotham	198.34	Support	<p>HBAL is a lifeline utility under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002. Cyclone Gabrielle highlighted the essential role of HBAL as a Lifeline Utility, with flood waters obstructing and causing significant damage to land transport networks. The Airport became the base for search and rescue teams, the link to the outside, source of generators, communications etc. This further emphasises why it is important to appropriately recognise and provide for the ongoing operation and development of Hawke's Bay Airport and the need for more robust access to the airport terminal and greater provision of apron space. Generally support the intent of this chapter and provisions which appropriately recognise the essential role of network utilities and enable the ongoing operation and development of network utilities, however Airport Activities within the Airport Zone should be managed through the designation and zone chapters, rather than the NU rules. An exclusion to this effect should therefore be included within the NU chapter.</p> <p>It is appropriate to limit the exclusion to Airport Activities within the Airport Zone only, as some airport activities occur beyond the Airport Zone (such as weather stations and navigational aids).</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P1: Essential role of network utilities	Ellen Robotham	198.35	Support	<p>HBAL is a lifeline utility under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002. Cyclone Gabrielle highlighted the essential role of HBAL as a Lifeline Utility, with flood waters obstructing and causing significant damage to land transport networks. The Airport became the base for search and rescue teams, the link to the outside, source of generators, communications etc. This further emphasises why it is important to appropriately recognise and provide for the ongoing operation and development of Hawke’s Bay Airport and the need for more robust access to the airport terminal and greater provision of apron space. Generally support the intent of this chapter and provisions which appropriately recognise the essential role of network utilities and enable the ongoing operation and development of network utilities, however Airport Activities within the Airport Zone should be managed through the designation and zone chapters, rather than the NU rules. An exclusion to this effect should therefore be included within the NU chapter.</p> <p>It is appropriate to limit the exclusion to Airport Activities within the Airport Zone only, as some airport activities occur beyond the Airport Zone (such as weather stations and navigational aids).</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P4: Adverse effects on network utilities	Ellen Robotham	198.36	Amend	<p>Considers it is imperative that infrastructure is protected from incompatible land use activities, including reverse sensitivity effects. Such matters are further elaborated on in the Noise chapter of the PDP. Subparagraph (e) requires further amendment to ensure that that physical obstructions within the obstacle limitation surfaces for Hawke’s Bay Airport are avoided in all zones, not just the Airport Zone. HBAL is a lifeline utility under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002. Cyclone Gabrielle highlighted the essential role of HBAL as a Lifeline Utility, with flood waters obstructing and causing significant damage to land transport networks. The Airport became the base for search and rescue teams, the link to the outside, source of generators, communications etc. This further emphasises why it is important to appropriately recognise and provide for the ongoing operation and development of Hawke’s Bay Airport and the need for more robust access to the airport terminal and greater provision of apron space. Generally support the intent of this chapter and provisions which appropriately recognise the essential role of network utilities and enable the ongoing operation and development of network utilities, however Airport Activities within the Airport Zone should be managed through the designation and zone chapters, rather than the NU rules. An exclusion to this effect should therefore be included within the NU chapter.</p> <p>It is appropriate to limit the exclusion to Airport Activities within the Airport Zone only, as some airport activities occur beyond the Airport Zone (such as weather stations and navigational aids).</p>	<p>Retain as notified, subject to the following amendment:</p> <p>(e) avoiding <del>physical obstructions within the Airport Zone buildings, structures and vegetation establishing within the</del> <u>obstacle limitation surfaces for Hawke’s Bay Airport.</u></p>	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /	Ellen Robotham	198.37	Amend	<p>Considers it is appropriate for the NU chapter to signal to plan users that some network utilities are managed under a designation. The amendments are required to the NU chapter to ensure that the methods do not inadvertently capture Airport Activities that are managed under the Airport Zone, thus creating a duplication of controls and consenting requirements. HBAL is a lifeline utility under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002. Cyclone Gabrielle highlighted the essential role of HBAL as a Lifeline Utility, with flood waters obstructing and causing significant damage to land transport networks. The Airport became the base for search and rescue teams, the link to the outside, source of generators, communications etc. This further emphasises why it is important to appropriately recognise and provide for the ongoing operation and development of Hawke's Bay Airport and the need for more robust access to the airport terminal and greater provision of apron space. Generally support the intent of this chapter and provisions which appropriately recognise the essential role of network utilities and enable the ongoing operation and development of network utilities, however Airport Activities within the Airport Zone should be managed through the designation and zone chapters, rather than the NU rules. An exclusion to this effect should therefore be included within the NU chapter.</p> <p>It is appropriate to limit the exclusion to Airport Activities within the Airport Zone only, as some airport activities occur beyond the Airport Zone (such as weather stations and navigational aids).</p>	<p>Amend to more explicitly exclude Airport Activities as follows:</p> <p>Network utilities may be exempt from rules because they operate under designations or national environmental standards, such as the National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities (2009) or the National Environmental Standards for Electricity Telecommunication Facilities (2008). Reference should be made to the Ministry for the Environment website for the latest version of any relevant National Environmental Standards.</p> <p><u>The methods within the NU chapter do not apply to Airport Activities undertaken in the Airport Zone. Such activities are managed under the Airport Zone chapter.</u></p>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R4: Construction of new network utilities and upgrading of existing network utilities (that are not regulated by an NES) within the Airport Zone (but not within the state highway)	Ellen Robotham	198.38	Oppose	<p>Airport activities, including upgrades, are managed by the Airport Zone provisions and therefore this rule is not necessary. Other network utilities not captured by the definition of Airport Activity can be provided for by NU-R1, NU-R2, and NU-R6 with consequential amendment. HBAL is a lifeline utility under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002. Cyclone Gabrielle highlighted the essential role of HBAL as a Lifeline Utility, with flood waters obstructing and causing significant damage to land transport networks. The Airport became the base for search and rescue teams, the link to the outside, source of generators, communications etc. This further emphasises why it is important to appropriately recognise and provide for the ongoing operation and development of Hawke's Bay Airport and the need for more robust access to the airport terminal and greater provision of apron space. HBAL generally support the intent of this chapter and provisions which appropriately recognise the essential role of network utilities and enable the ongoing operation and development of network utilities.</p> <p>HBAL submits however, that Airport Activities within the Airport Zone should be managed through the designation and zone chapters, rather than the NU rules. An exclusion to this effect should therefore be included within the NU chapter.</p> <p>It is appropriate to limit the exclusion to Airport Activities within the Airport Zone only, as some airport activities occur beyond the Airport Zone (such as weather stations and navigational aids).</p>	Delete NU-R4.	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R6: Construction of new network utilities (that are not regulated by an NES) not already provided for in NU-R4 (within the Airport Zone) and NU-R5 (within National Grid Yard) in all zones and precincts, except the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and/or River Conservation Zones	Ellen Robotham	198.39	Amend	Seeks a consequential amendment to a previous submission point.HBAL is a lifeline utility under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002. Cyclone Gabrielle highlighted the essential role of HBAL as a Lifeline Utility, with flood waters obstructing and causing significant damage to land transport networks. The Airport became the base for search and rescue teams, the link to the outside, source of generators, communications etc. This further emphasises why it is important to appropriately recognise and provide for the ongoing operation and development of Hawke’s Bay Airport and the need for more robust access to the airport terminal and greater provision of apron space.HBAL generally support the intent of this chapter and provisions which appropriately recognise the essential role of network utilities and enable the ongoing operation and development of network utilities. HBAL submits however, that Airport Activities within the Airport Zone should be managed through the designation and zone chapters, rather than the NU rules. An exclusion to this effect should therefore be included within the NU chapter.It is appropriate to limit the exclusion to Airport Activities within the Airport Zone only, as some airport activities occur beyond the Airport Zone (such as weather stations and navigational aids).	Amend as follows:  NU-R6: Construction of new network utilities (that are not regulated by an NES) not already provided for in <del>NU-R4 (within the Airport Zone) and</del> NU-R5 (within National Grid Yard) in all zones and precincts, except the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and/or River Conservation Zones.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-O1: Essential role of network utilities	Georgina McPherson	215.29	Support	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this objective and seek that it be retained.	Retain NU-O1 as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-O2: Adverse effects of network utilities	Georgina McPherson	215.30	Amend	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this objective and seek that it be retained with minor amendment.	Retain NU-O2 as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-O3: Adverse effects on network utilities	Georgina McPherson	215.31	Support	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this objective and seek that it be retained.	Retain NU-O3 as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P1: Essential role of network utilities	Georgina McPherson	215.32	Support	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this policy and seek that it be retained.	Retain NU-P1 as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P2: Adverse effects of network utilities	Georgina McPherson	215.33	Support	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this policy. However, the ability for infrastructure to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects must be considered in the context of the functional and operational needs of infrastructure, which can limit the ability to manage certain adverse effects. This is appropriately recognised in objective NU-O2, to which this policy relates, and is a critical matter that should be carried through to the associated policy NU-P2.	Amend NU-P2 to ensure the ability to manage adverse effects associated with infrastructure is considered in the context of the functional and operational needs of that infrastructure. This could be achieved by making the following changes or changes to the same effect:  NU-P2: Adverse effects of network utilities ... e. encouraging the removal of redundant and superseded above ground network utility facilities. .... <u>while recognising the extent to which adverse effects can be avoided may be constrained by the functional or operational needs of the infrastructure.</u>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P3: Adverse effects of network utilities on protected areas and sites of significance	Georgina McPherson	215.34	Support	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this policy and seek that it be retained.	Retain NU-P3 as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P4: Adverse effects on network utilities	Georgina McPherson	215.35	Support	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this policy and seek that it be retained.	Retain NU-P4 as notified.	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R1: Operation, maintenance, replacement, and removal of existing network	Georgina McPherson	215.36	Amend	<p>The Fuel Companies support the intent of rule NU-R1 and seek that it be retained. For certainty, it is considered the rule should specifically provide for 'repair' of existing network utilities, which would have the same effect as, but not necessarily fall to be considered as 'maintenance' or 'replacement' works. The permitted rule is subject to compliance with standards NU-S1 to NU-S11. The Fuel Companies are concerned that some existing network utility activities will be non-compliant when undertaking replacement, repair and removal works in accordance with the boundary setbacks in standard NU-S1. NU-S1 gives no consideration to whether or not the activity is in relation to an existing or new structure. For the avoidance of doubt the Fuel Companies seek that a clarification is added that this setback does not apply to existing lawfully established activities. This could be achieved by deleting the requirement for activities undertaken in accordance with NU-R1 to comply with NU-S1.</p> <p>The default to restricted discretionary activity status (rule NU-R1B), and the associated matters of discretion, for activities that do not meet the permitted activity requirements is supported.</p>	<p>Amend NU-R1 to clarify that it applies to 'repair' of existing network utilities as well as operation, maintenance, replacement and removal. This could be achieved by making the following changes:</p> <p>NU-R1: Operation, maintenance, replacement, <u>repair</u> and removal of existing network utilities (that are not regulated by an NES) in all zones and precincts</p> <p>NU-R1A Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The activity complies with relevant standards (NU-S1 NU-S2–NU-S11), and</li> <li>2. ...</li> </ol>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R2: Minor upgrading of existing network utilities in all zones and precincts	Georgina McPherson	215.37	Amend	<p>The Fuel Companies support the general intent of rule NU-R2A but consider it is unnecessary and inappropriate to restrict the scope of the rule to electricity, gas or telecommunications equipment. The effects of minor upgrades to existing wharflines and bunkerlines (petroleum distribution networks) are essentially the same as those associated with the minor upgrade of other underground network utility pipes. These activities should be treated equally in the Proposed Plan, to ensure timely upgrades, including for safety and efficiency purposes, the realignment, reconfiguration or relocation of petroleum pipelines at the port and along their length to the Terminals can occur. See full submission for greater detail.</p>	<p>Amend NU-R2 to clarify that it applies to petroleum distribution pipes, and to provide clarity around the scope of replacement pipes that will fall to be considered as 'minor upgrading'. This could be achieved by making the following changes or changes to the same effect:</p> <p>NU-R2A</p> <p>Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The realignment, reconfiguration, relocation, or replacement of electricity, <u>petroleum</u> and gas distribution, or telecommunication line, pipe, pole, conductors, cross arms, switches, transformers, cabinets, or ancillary structures must be:</li> <li>9. The diameter of above ground or below ground replacement pipes must not exceed the diameter of the replaced pipe by more than 300 mm.</li> </ol>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R6: Construction of new network utilities (that are not regulated by an NES) not already provided for in NU-R4 (within the Airport Zone) and NU-R5 (within National Grid Yard) in all zones and precincts, except the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and/or River Conservation Zones	Georgina McPherson	215.38	Support	<p>The Fuel Companies support the intent of rule NU-R6 and seek that it be retained.</p>	<p>Retain NU-R6 as notified.</p>	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R10: New electrical vehicle charging facilities in all zones and precincts	Georgina McPherson	215.39	Amend	Public charging infrastructure plays a critical role in enabling the uptake in electric vehicles (EVs). The Fuel Companies support a permitted activity rule for EV charging facilities. However, it is not clear that this rule applies to EV charging facilities at services stations as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service station operators are not typically network utility operators such that it is unclear whether they will be able to rely on a rule relating to electric vehicle charging facilities that is located within the network utilities chapter.</li> <li>• Existing services stations will have vehicle parking; however, depending on the layout of each site, new spaces may be created for electric vehicle charging, which would not fall to be considered as existing or consenting parking spaces.</li> <li>• The term vehicle depot is not defined in the plan, nor is it used in any other provisions – the only other reference is in the definition of port related activities.</li> <li>• The term ‘garage’ is not defined in the plan. Service stations are colloquially referred to as garages, however it is not clear that the plan intends this interpretation.</li> </ul>	Amend NU-R10 to ensure electric vehicle charging facilities at service stations are provided for on the same basis as electric vehicle charging facilities currently subject to Rule NU-R10. This could be achieved by making the following changes or changes to the same effect:  NU-R10A Activity Status: Permitted  Where: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The activity is installed in association with an existing permitted or consented vehicle park, vehicle depot, <u>service station</u> or garage structure;</li> <li>2. The activity complies with standards (NU-S1 – NU-S11);</li> <li>3. The activity complies with standard NU-S12 (Radio Frequency Fields) and standard NU-S13 (Electric and Magnetic Fields), and</li> <li>4. The activity is not within the National Grid Yard.</li> <li>5. For the purposes of this rule, the operator of the electric vehicle charging facility is not required to be a network utility operator as defined in the RMA.</li> </ol> OR As an alternative to proposed new clause 5 above, the wording of the definition of Network Utility Operator used in the Proposed Plan could be amended to specify that for the purposes of this	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R14: Activities not otherwise provided for (that are not regulated by an NES)	Georgina McPherson	215.40	Support	The Fuel Companies support the intent of rule NU-R14 and seek that it be retained.	Retain NU-R14 as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S1: Setbacks	Georgina McPherson	215.41	Amend	Fuel Companies seek that a clarification is added that this setback does not apply to existing lawfully established activities. This could be achieved by deleting the requirement for activities undertaken in accordance with NU-R1 to comply with NU-S1. The Fuel Companies support the matters of discretion. The Fuel Companies support the intent of this standard for new network utilities, however, note that it will mean that some existing network utility activities will be non-compliant when undertaking replacement, repair and removal works under NU-R1. NU-S1 gives no consideration to whether or not the activity is in relation to an existing or new structure.	Amend NU-R1 to ensure the operation, maintenance, replacement and removal of existing network utilities does not have to comply with the boundary setback requirements contained in NU-S1. This could be achieved by making the following changes or changes to the same effect:  NU-R1: Operation, maintenance, replacement, and removal of existing network utilities (that are not regulated by an NES) in all zones and precincts  NU-R1A Activity Status: Permitted  Where:  The activity complies with relevant standards ( <del>NU-S1-NU-S2</del> – NU-S11), and ...	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S1: Setbacks	Georgina McPherson	215.42	Support	The Fuel Companies support the intent of standard NU-S1.2 and seek that it be retained	Retain NU-S1.2 as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S3: Height for above ground structures (other than buildings)	Georgina McPherson	215.43	Amend	There is a numbering error in NU-S3.5 relating to the height of above ground structures in the commercial, mixed use, and rural zones, whereby the height threshold of 20m is preceded by a ‘1’ rather than an ‘a’, as per the format used in all other clauses. This creates the potential for misinterpretation that the height limit is set at 1.20m rather than 20m. This editorial error should be corrected.	Amend NU-S3.5 to correct the editorial error in numbering, as follows:  5. Any part of an above ground structure (other than buildings), including aerials, must not exceed a height  of:  <del>1.20 m.</del> a. 20m	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S4: Floor space & dimensions	Georgina McPherson	215.44	Support	Support this provision. NU-S4(2) setting a permitted activity threshold for EV charging facilities of 3m2 is accepted as reasonable.	Retain NU-S4 as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S8: Parking and access	Georgina McPherson	215.45	Oppose	Standard NU-S8 requires that any network utility on a site that is more than 200m2 in area, must meet standards TPT-S4 (Vehicle Access (General)), TPT-S5 (Vehicle Access (Restrictions)), and TPT- S6 (Manoeuvring) in the Transport chapter. For the Fuel Companies, the implication would be that any proposal to install EV charging facilities at an existing service station or to undertake maintenance or repair work to the existing wharflines / bunkerlines where they are located within the Terminal sites, would trigger the need to consider compliance with vehicle access and manoeuvring requirements. That is inappropriate in the context of existing activities where the 'network utility' is an ancillary component of the overall activity, and where there are established vehicle accesses and manoeuvring areas.	Amend NU-S8 to clarify that the parking and access standards in the Transport chapter apply only to those network utilities that are permanently staffed, consistent with the stated purpose of the rule, and to avoid inappropriate regulation of established facilities on large sites where the 'network utility' is ancillary to or incidental to the primary activity. This could be achieved by making the following changes or changes to the same effect:  NU-S8: Parking and access  All zones and associated precincts  Purpose: to ensure safe and efficient access and sufficient onsite parking is provided where network utilities are permanently staffed.  <u>1. Any network utility with a requirement for permanent staff that is distinct to the staffing needs of other activities on the site, on a site that is more than 200 m2 in area, must meet the requirements for access in the Transport chapter in standards, TPT-S4 (Vehicle Access (General)), TPT-S5 (Vehicle Access (Restrictions)), and TPT-S6 (Manoeuvring).</u>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S10: Pipelines, cables, conductors, and lines	Georgina McPherson	215.46	Support	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this standard.	Retain NU-S10 as notified	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S11: Removal of derelict above ground network utilities	Georgina McPherson	215.47	Support	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this standard and seek that it be retained.	Retain NU-S11 as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Assessment Criteria /General	Georgina McPherson	215.48	Support	The Fuel Companies are generally supportive of the Network Utility Assessment Criteria and seek that they are retained.	Retain NU-AC1 to NU-AC12 as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R10: New electrical vehicle charging facilities in all zones and precincts	Shravan Miryala	217.8	Amend	Supports a permitted activity rule for EV charging facilities as public charging infrastructure is vital for EV uptake. However, considers that it is not clear that this rule applies to EV charging facilities at services stations as: Seeks specific reference to "service stations" under the rule to avoid confusion and clarifies that EV charging facilities may be operated by parties other than "network utility operators." Considers that references to standards NU-S12 and NU-S13 regarding radio frequency and electric/magnetic fields are irrelevant to EV charging facilities and should be deleted. Supports the default to restricted discretionary activity status for activities not meeting permitted activity requirements, along with associated matters of discretion.	Amend NU-R10A to ensure electric vehicle charging facilities at service stations are provided for on the same basis as electric vehicle charging facilities currently subject to Rule NU-R10. This could be achieved by making the following changes or changes to the same effect:  NU-R10A Activity Status: Permitted Where:  1. The activity is installed in association with an existing permitted or consented vehicle park, vehicle depot, <u>service station</u> or garage structure;  2. The activity complies with standards (NU-S1 – NU-S11);  <del>3. The activity complies with standard NU-S12 (Radio Frequency Fields) and standard NU-S13 (Electric and Magnetic Fields), and</del>  4. The activity is not within the National Grid Yard.  5. For the purposes of this rule, the operator of the electric vehicle charging facility is not required to be a network utility operator as defined in the RMA.  OR	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R10: New electrical vehicle charging facilities in all zones and precincts	Shravan Miryala	217.9	Support	Supports the intent of Rule NU-R10B and seeks that it be retained.	Retain NU-R10B as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R6: Construction of new network utilities (that are not regulated by an NES) not already provided for in NU-R4 (within the Airport Zone) and NU-R5 (within National Grid Yard) in all zones and precincts, except the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and/or River Conservation Zones	Amelia Longley	222.129	Amend	Open Space Zones have been referenced incorrectly.	Amend as sought... <del>Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and/or River Conservation Zones</del> Open Space and Recreation Zones, and Stadium Zone.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R7: Construction of new underground network utilities in the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and/or River Conservation Zones	Amelia Longley	222.130	Amend	Open Space Zones have been referenced incorrectly.	Amend as sought  ... <del>Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and/or River Conservation Zones</del> Open Space and Recreation Zones, and Stadium Zone.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R12: New above ground network utilities within the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and/or River Conservation Zones (that are not regulated by an NES)	Amelia Longley	222.131	Amend	Open Space Zones have been referenced incorrectly.	Amend as sought  ... <del>Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and/or River Conservation Zones</del> Open Space and Recreation Zones, and Stadium Zone.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S3: Height for above ground structures (other than buildings)	Amelia Longley	222.132	Amend	Open Space Zones have been referenced incorrectly.	Amend as sought. <del>Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and River Conservation Zones</del> Open Space and Recreation Zones, and Stadium Zone and associated Precincts.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /General	Angela Jones	240.5	Amend	Seeks the inclusion of the definition of 'customer connection' to be sought, as the proposed rules for network utilities do not explicitly permit lines extending from the road to customers houses.	Seeks consequential changes to the Network Utilities chapter for the inclusion of 'customer connection' as a permitted activity.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R2: Minor upgrading of existing network utilities in all zones and precincts	Angela Jones	240.6	Oppose	Seeks that NU.R2A.1(a) be amended to remove the requirement for any new electricity structures, including lines, be within 5m of the existing alignment or location. Notes that the submitter's infrastructure will often need to be relocated beyond 5m to avoid other network utilities, unsuitable ground conditions or sensitive environments. Considers it unreasonable to require a resource consent for moving any of its infrastructure by more than 5m.	Delete condition NU.R2A.1	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R6: Construction of new network utilities (that are not regulated by an NES) not already provided for in NU-R4 (within the Airport Zone) and NU-R5 (within National Grid Yard) in all zones and precincts, except the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and/or River Conservation Zones	Angela Jones	240.7	Oppose	Seeks that NU-R6A.2 be deleted to remove the requirement that electrical lines be underground in all zones (except the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and/or River Conservation Zones). Opposes as it is unclear why it is necessary for lines to be underground in zones such as the Rural Zone which cover large areas of the city, in which it is not practical to underground all new lines. Notes that Standard NU-S3 includes permitted heights for above ground structures, and therefore this is the appropriate method to be used to control the effects of above-ground structures.	Delete condition NU-R6A.2	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S1: Setbacks	Angela Jones	240.8	Amend	Seeks specific reference to poles as being permitted to provide clarity of the necessary setback for a key electricity distribution structure.	Amend NU-S1.1(d) and NU-S1.2(2) to include 'poles'	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S4: Floor space & dimensionsAll zones and associated precincts	Angela Jones	240.9	Oppose	Seeks the gross floor area limits in NU-S4.1 be increased. Opposes as the limits as currently proposed would require submitter to obtain resource consent for substations and other above ground buildings and structures. Notes concern with the 10m2 GFA limit for buildings and structures in road reserves as this is a primary location for the submitters infrastructure throughout the city. This condition does not have regard for the specific location of the road reserve (i.e.: what the adjoining zone is).	Amend NU-S4.1 to increase the gross floor area limits for any above ground building or structure	Open Submission



# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S10: Pipelines, cables, conductors, and linesAll zones and associated precincts	Angela Jones	240.10	Oppose	Opposes as it is unclear why these conditions are required as they do not appear to relate to the effects listed in the Matters of Discretion under NU-S10. The standard will require the submitter to obtain resource consent for most of its lines that cross a waterbody. Seeks the deletion of conditions NU-S10.2 and NU-S10.3	Delete conditions NU-S10.2 and NU-S10.3	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Introduction /	Trevor Ellis	253.31	Amend	The introduction to the Network Utilities chapter includes in the third paragraph that the District Plan will provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of network utilities throughout the region while managing adverse effects on the environment.Considers that while there is a forthcoming Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter, there should be strict mention of the need to avoid, remedy, and minimise adverse effects instead.	seeks to amend the third paragraph of the Network Utilities chapter as follows:  To achieve this, the network utility provisions in the District Plan provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of network utilities throughout the district while <u>avoiding, minimising, and remedying</u> managing their adverse effects on the environment  (particularly in sensitive environments such as the coastal environment, outstanding and significant landscapes, significant natural areas, areas containing cultural or historic heritage values, and areas subject to natural hazards). As many network utilities are lineal and traverse many parts of the district, it is considered appropriate that a single set of rules be provided that apply across the District.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P2: Adverse effects of network utilities	Trevor Ellis	253.32	Support	considers that avoid, remedying, and mitigating adverse effects on natural and physical resources assists in the implementation of the Act, NZCPS and NPS-IB.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P3: Adverse effects of network utilities on protected areas and sites of significance	Trevor Ellis	253.33	Amend	NU-P3 lists several protected areas and sites of significance but does not include the coastal environment.Considers that the coastal environment and special character landscapes, which includes the Ahuriri Estuary, are sensitive environments that house significant indigenous and migratory fauna and significant indigenous flora. The sensitive nature of these environments is stated in their respective chapters of CE and AESZ in the proposed Plan. These areas are vulnerable to adverse effects from network utilities and should have special precaution taken when approaching the establishment, operation, and maintenance.	seeks to amend NU-P3 as follows or with similar wording:  1. Manage the adverse effects of upgrades to and development of new network utilities on: a. outstanding natural features and significant landscapes; b. significant natural areas; c. sites of significance to Māori; and d. historic heritage areas, heritage items, and notable trees; e. Indigenous biodiversity and f. coastal environment,while recognising the extent to which adverse effects can be avoided or may be constrained by a network utility's functional or operational need	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R11: Temporary network utilities in all zones and precincts	Trevor Ellis	253.34	Amend	considers that temporary structures for network utilities can have significant adverse effects despite the short term that they stand. NU-P2 and NU-P3 should be added as requirements that must be adhered to for the activity to be permitted.	seeks to add policies NU-P2 and NU-P3 under NU-R11A as matters of discretion.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R11: Temporary network utilities in all zones and precincts	Trevor Ellis	253.35	Amend	considers that temporary structures for network utilities can have significant adverse effects despite the short term that they stand. NU-P2 and NU-P3 should be added as matters of discretion that must be adhered to for the activity to be permitted.	seeks to amend NU-R11B so that if NU-P2 and/or NU-P3 are not met the Activity Status is Discretionary.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R12: New above ground network utilities within the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and/or River Conservation Zones (that are not regulated by an NES)	Trevor Ellis	253.36	Amend	The Introduction to the Network Utilities chapter stated that particular care should be taken for the establishment of network utilities in environments such as the target of Rule 12A. considers that the activity status of the rule should reflect the intention of the introduction and be changed to Restricted Discretionary. Matters of control, or now matters of discretion, should be expanded to include impacts on ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity.	1. seeks to amend activity status of NU-R12A from Controlled to Restricted Discretionary. 2. seeks to amend matters of control/discretion to include impacts on ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity and natural character.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S3: Height for above ground structures (other than buildings)	Trevor Ellis	253.37	Amend	considers that matters of discretion for "Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and River Conservation Zones and associated Precincts" should include effects on indigenous biodiversity considering the purpose of the zones and areas.	seeks to add to the matters of discretion "effects on indigenous biodiversity" to "Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and River Conservation Zones and Associated Precincts"	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S7: Light spill	Trevor Ellis	253.38	Amend	considers that any light spill that occurs in an area of significant indigenous biodiversity or habitat of indigenous biodiversity should require a lower lux spill to ensure the wellbeing and safety of light sensitive fauna such as long-tailed bats.	seeks to amend the standard to include a lower lux requirement to protect indigenous biodiversity.	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-03: Adverse effects on network utilities	Leanne Roberts	257.21	Support	HortNZ supports that network utilities are not compromised by incompatible activities.	Seeks to retain NU-03.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P4: Adverse effects on network utilities	Leanne Roberts	257.22	Amend	Considers the objective sought that network utilities are not compromised by incompatible activities, but the policy seeks to 'protect' network utilities. The policy should implement the objective. Clause f and h duplicate provisions for electricity distribution lines. There are no specific rules for activities near electricity distribution lines so it should be clear that the policy is achieved through NZECP34:2001.	Seeks to amend NU-P4 to read: <del>Protect</del> <u>Ensure that</u> network utilities are not compromised by the adverse effects of subdivision use and development that may constrain or compromise the safe and effective, secure and efficient operation ...  Seeks to delete clause h  Amend clause g) by adding: through compliance with NZECP34:2001	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P6: Adverse effects of the National Grid Yard and National Grid Corridor	Leanne Roberts	257.23	Amend	In the rural areas the National Grid should seek to avoid to the extent reasonably possible adverse effects on highly productive land.	Seeks to amend NU-P6 d) by adding:  <u>And to the extent reasonably possible adverse effects on highly productive land.</u>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R13: Buildings or structures within the National Grid Yard in all zones	Leanne Roberts	257.24	Support	HortNZ supports the provisions for artificial crop protection structures in 5c)	Seeks to retain NU- R13A 5 c)	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /General	Nichola Nicholson	264.18	Amend	Considers it important to amend the definition of network utilities so that small-scale monitoring devices and structures are permitted in all zones.	Amend PDP to allow (permit) the use and development of land for small-scale environmental monitoring devices and associated earthworks and structures.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-02: Adverse effects of network utilities	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.20	Oppose	Opposes Objective NU-02: Adverse effects of network utilities as the addition of the words 'recognition of functional and operational needs' helps to create a balance of assessment.	Amend Objective NU-02: Adverse effects of network utilities as follows:  The adverse effects of network utilities on the environment are avoided, remedied, or mitigated, <del>as far as is practicable</del> , while recognising the functional and operational needs of network utilities (including those associated with their scale, design, and locational requirements).	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P3: Adverse effects of network utilities on protected areas and sites of significance	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.22	Oppose	Opposes NU - Network utilities Policy NU-P3: Adverse effects of network utilities on protected areas and sites of significance as the policy should explicitly refer to heritage Precincts and Overlay areas. It is unclear whether 'Historic Heritage Areas' and 'Heritage Character Areas' are intended to apply to these areas. Historic heritage places / areas are referred in sub-sections 1 and 2. The reference to 'Heritage Character Areas' should be deleted; alternatively section 1 may be amended to refer to 'Historic Heritage Items' and change section 2 to refer to 'Heritage Overlays and Precincts'.	Amend NU-P3: Adverse effects of network utilities on protected areas and sites of significance as follows:  1. Manage the adverse effects of upgrades to and development of new network utilities on: a. outstanding natural features and significant landscapes; b. significant natural areas; c. sites of significance to Māori, and d. <u>The values of historic heritage areas overlays and precincts, heritage items, and notable trees.</u>  2. Manage the adverse effects of upgrades to and the development of new network utilities on the values and attributes of areas identified in the District Plan as: a. high natural character areas; b. <del>heritage character areas</del> and c. significant amenity features	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R6: Construction of new network utilities (that are not regulated by an NES) not already provided for in NU-R4 (within the Airport Zone) and NU-R5 (within National Grid Yard) in all zones and precincts, except the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and/or River Conservation Zones	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.23	Oppose	Opposes NU - Network utilities NU-R6: Construction of new network utilities (that are not regulated by an NES) not already provided for in NU-R4 (within the Airport Zone) and NU-R5 (within National Grid Yard) in all zones and precincts, except the Estuary, Foreshore Reserve, Reserve and / or River Conservation Zones) as despite general text and policies that refers to managing effects on heritage, this is not reflected in the Rule structure. In particular, proposed rules do not give effect to policy NU-P3. The location of works within or close to scheduled heritage items and heritage precincts/overlays generally do not trigger resource consent, with some limited exceptions. New network facilities have the potential to create significant adverse effects on heritage values, and should be controlled by way of district plan rules and standards.	Amend NU-R6A as follows:  <u>4. The activity is not within a site containing Historic Heritage as identified in Schedule 3, or within a heritage precinct or overlay as identified in Schedule 4.</u>  Activity Status where activity conditions 1 or 2 or <u>4</u> are not met: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to:  <u>5. Effects on historic heritage values</u>	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /Issues /NU-I1: Essential role of network utilities	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.25	Support	Supports the policies as worded as they provide for the essential role of network utilities and the impact other activities can have on the effective and efficient operation, maintenance and development of network utilities.	Retain as notified	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Issues /NU-I3: The impact of activities on network utilities	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.26	Support	Supports the policies as worded as they provide for the essential role of network utilities and the impact other activities can have on the effective and efficient operation, maintenance and development of network utilities.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-O1: Essential role of network utilities	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.27	Support	Supports objectives NU-O1 and NU-O2. Supports NU-O1 as it recognises and promotes the need for network utilities to be resilient, particularly where they provide a lifeline function. Considers NU-O2 recognises the need to protect network utilities against reverse sensitivity effects. Notes that the regional state highway network provides a critical role in connecting communities to hospitals, airports, petrol stations and supermarkets both after natural hazards and during day-to-day life.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-O2: Adverse effects of network utilities	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.28	Support	Supports objectives NU-O1 and NU-O2. Supports NU-O1 as it recognises and promotes the need for network utilities to be resilient, particularly where they provide a lifeline function. Considers that NU-O2 recognises the need to protect network utilities against reverse sensitivity effects. Notes that the regional state highway network provides a critical role in connecting communities to hospitals, airports, petrol stations and supermarkets both after natural hazards and during day-to-day life.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P1: Essential role of network utilities	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.29	Support	Supports policy NU-P1 as it recognises the functional role that network utilities, including state highways, provide in supporting the day to day lives of communities.	Retain as notified	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P4: Adverse effects on network utilities	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.30	Amend	Seeks the inclusion of protecting the national, regional and arterial road network from noise	Amend as below: b. managing new activities that are sensitive to noise adjoining the railway corridor, <del>the</del> and the national, regional and arterial road network (or similar)	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R1: Operation, maintenance, replacement, and removal of existing network utilities (that are not regulated by an NES) in all zones and precincts	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.31	Support	Supports rule NU-R1 as it allows for the operation, maintenance of an existing network utility.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R8: Construction of new cycleways or walkways within roads and reconstruction (including realignment or widening) of existing cycleways or walkways within roads in all zones and precincts	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.32	Support	Supports rule NU-R8 as it enables the construction of cycleways and walkways within roads to encourage travel by active modes.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /NU-R10: New electrical vehicle charging facilities in all zones and precincts	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.33	Support	Supports rule NU-R10 as it enables the installation of charging infrastructure to support electric vehicles. Considers encouraging this infrastructure will support transitioning the transport sector to more environmentally friendly vehicles.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S1: Setbacks	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.34	Support	Supports S1 as roads (including road reserve), cycleways and walkways do not require a setback from adjoining residential activities.	Retain as notified	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S5: Sight distances	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.35	Support	Supports standard NU-S5 as it ensures the safety, efficiency and functions of the road network, including state highways, is not affected. Notes that the Code of Practice for Subdivision and Land Development prescribes sightline safety requirements that align with the NZTA standards.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S6: Noise and vibration	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.36	Amend	Oppose in part the intent of standard NU-S6. Noise limits for construction work are generally set within designation conditions for road projects. Notes that most projects adopt one of the sets of suggested limits from New Zealand Standard NZS 6803:1999 Acoustics – construction noise. Submitter manages and minimises potentially unreasonable noise effects during construction activities (as far as practicable) in accordance with this standard.	Excludes construction or maintenance works on state highways as NZTA need to comply NZS 6803:1999 Acoustics – construction noise standards anyway.	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S7: Light spill	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.37	Support	Supports standard NU-S7 as it manages the effects of light spill and glare on roads.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Standards Table /NU-S9: Signs	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.38	Support	Supports standard NU-S9 as it has the potential to manage the safety effects of network utility signs on the state highway network.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-O1: Essential role of network utilities	Alec Duncan	288.19	Support	Has a specific interest in the provision of water supply distribution systems and transport networks due to their essential role in facilitating an effective and efficient emergency response. As such, Fire and Emergency supports NU-O1 insofar that the objective requires network utility operators to provide safe and resilient network utilities that provide essential and secure services, including in emergencies, that enable people and communities to provide for their health, safety, and wellbeing. This would include firefighting water supply and access within and along the transport network so Fire and Emergency can respond in an emergency.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-O3: Adverse effects on network utilities	Alec Duncan	288.20	Support	Supports NU-O3 insofar that the objective requires that network utilities are not compromised by incompatible subdivision, land use, or development. It is important that any new subdivision, land use or development is assessed based on its ability to be serviced by the reticulated water supply network as well as the transport network to enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently in an emergency.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P1: Essential role of network utilities	Alec Duncan	288.21	Support	Has a specific interest in the provision of water supply distribution systems and transport networks due to their essential role in facilitating an effective and efficient emergency response. As such, Fire and Emergency supports NU-P1 insofar that the policy recognises the importance and benefits of network utilities, including as lifeline utilities during an emergency. This includes the water supply and transport network which facilitate Fire and Emergency operations. Fire and Emergency specifically support providing flexibility for network utilities to adopt new technologies that improve access to and efficient use of networks and services, allowing increased resilience, safety, reliability, or result in environmental benefits and enhancements where these can benefit emergency response activities.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P4: Adverse effects on network utilities	Alec Duncan	288.22	Amend	Supports NU-P4 insofar that the policy requires the protection of network utilities from the adverse effects of subdivision, land use, or development. It is important that any new subdivision, land use, or development is assessed based on its ability to be serviced by the reticulated water supply network and that this does not constrain or compromise the level of service available for firefighting for existing activities. This would also include the management of adverse effects on the transport network where development could compromise the ability for Fire and Emergency to effectively and efficiently respond in a fire or other emergency. Fire and Emergency therefore request amendments to reflect this.	Add new and amend as follows:  NU-P4: Adverse effects on network utilities ... c. managing access to the railway corridor and to the national, regional, and arterial <u>and local</u> road network; ... <u>i. managing connections to Council's reticulated water supply network by ensuring there is sufficient firefighting capacity available for the proposed activity.</u>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /General /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.34	Amend	Considers the overlap between these chapters makes it very confusing to understand which infrastructure activities are addressed and in which chapter(s) they are addressed. The overlap between provisions in these chapters also makes it unclear how effects are managed and to understand implications for how the ECO provisions may or may not apply to these activities.	Seeks clarification of what activities are addressed in which chapters.  Include provisions for infrastructure that is not a "network utility", "renewable energy generation", "Stormwater" or "transport".  Rename the section heading or change section names to Energy, Infrastructure and Transport.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /General /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.34	Amend	Considers the overlap between these chapters makes it very confusing to understand which infrastructure activities are addressed and in which chapter(s) they are addressed. The overlap between provisions in these chapters also makes it unclear how effects are managed and to understand implications for how the ECO provisions may or may not apply to these activities.	Seeks clarification of what activities are addressed in which chapters. Include provisions for infrastructure that is not a "network utility", "renewable energy generation", "Stormwater" or "transport". Rename the section heading or change section names to Energy, Infrastructure and Transport.	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /Introduction /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.36	Amend	Considers not all network utilities provide critical services as lifeline utilities nor are all network utilities recognised as nationally significant with specific provision for them under a national policy statement. Where the plan is more stringent than the NESETA or NESTF regulations the plan should apply over the NES. This is necessary to ensure effects are managed in accordance with the district plan for Napier.	Seeks clarification of the scope of the chapter and to distinguish between network utilities that are lifeline utilities and those that are not.  Include a definition for critical infrastructure/lifeline utilities consistent with the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002.  Amend the section on Introduction to explain that where the plan has more stringent provisions those provisions apply over the NESETA or NESTF.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Introduction /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.36	Amend	Considers not all network utilities provide critical services as lifeline utilities nor are all network utilities recognised as nationally significant with specific provision for them under a national policy statement. Where the plan is more stringent than the NESETA or NESTF regulations the plan should apply over the NES. This is necessary to ensure effects are managed in accordance with the district plan for Napier.	Seeks clarification of the scope of the chapter and to distinguish between network utilities that are lifeline utilities and those that are not.  Include a definition for critical infrastructure/lifeline utilities consistent with the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002.  Amend the section on Introduction to explain that where the plan has more stringent provisions those provisions apply over the NESETA or NESTF.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-O1: Essential role of network utilities Safe, effective, efficient, and resilient network utilities throughout the city, that provide essential integrated and secure services, including in emergencies, and enable people and communities to provide for their health, safety, and wellbeing.	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.37	Amend	Considers the objective should clarify what essential services are in terms of lifeline utilities.	Seeks to amend the objective to address "lifeline utilities" and add a definition of lifeline utilities consistent with the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-O1: Essential role of network utilities Safe, effective, efficient, and resilient network utilities throughout the city, that provide essential integrated and secure services, including in emergencies, and enable people and communities to provide for their health, safety, and wellbeing.	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.37	Amend	Considers the objective should clarify what essential services are in terms of lifeline utilities.	Seeks to amend the objective to address "lifeline utilities" and add a definition of lifeline utilities consistent with the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Objectives /NU-O2: Adverse effects of network utilities The adverse effects of network utilities on the environment are avoided, remedied, or mitigated, as far as is practicable, while recognising the functional and operational needs of network utilities (including those associated with their scale, design, and locational requirements).	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.38	Amend	Considers the objective as proposed to be inconsistent with the NZCPS and the RMA. As an outcome, an objective that "avoided, remedied, or mitigated, as far as is practicable," is uncertain as to the extent of adverse effects on the environment not be addressed by avoidance, remediation or mitigation. While it may be appropriate in some cases to only avoid adverse effects "as far as practicable" there are cases where adverse effects are to be avoided or significant adverse effects are to be avoided and other effects avoided, remedied and mitigated, such as under the NZCPS. The recognition of functional and operational needs for "strategic network utilities" (as captured by the RPS definition of Strategic Infrastructure) is for strategic integration of infrastructure with land use, rather than as a consideration for interpreting adverse effects on the environment as this objective suggests. This broader consideration could be captured in policy rather than an objective. Any specific recognition of constraints in terms of adverse effects on the environment should be limited to the NPSET at the policy level (NPSET Policy 4). The objective as proposed may conflict with the ECO and NH chapters reducing the effectiveness of provisions for achieving the purpose of the Act.	Amend as follows:  The adverse effects of network utilities on the environment are avoided, remedied, or mitigated, as far as is practicable, while recognising the functional and operational needs of network utilities (including those associated with their scale, design, and locational requirements).  Consider including a new policy:  "Recognising the functional and operational needs of network utilities (including those associated with their scale, design, and locational requirements) in managing land use, subdivision and development activities."	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P1: Essential role of network utilities	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.39	Amend	Considers specific provision should be made for lifeline utilities separate to other utilities. The provision as worded may be inconsistent with the NZCPS and could conflict with the ECO chapter provisions. The policy needs to be clarified to ensure that provision for activities is in the context of avoiding, remedying and mitigating adverse effects on the environment. It is unclear how this policy for “network utilities” relates to NU-P2 for “infrastructure” due to the use of different terminology. For the reason provided in the submission point for NU-O2 recognising functional and operational needs should be specific to strategic network utilities as captured by the RPS definition of Strategic infrastructure”.	Delete.  Or amend clauses (a) and (b):  a. <del>enabling</del> <u>providing for the effective and reasonable</u> operation, maintenance, repair, minor upgrade and removal of network utilities throughout the city, <u>while managing adverse effects on the environment</u> ; b. providing for upgrades to, and the development of, new network utilities <u>where adverse effects on the environment can be avoided, remedied or mitigated</u> ;  Amend:  d. recognising the functional and operational needs of <u>strategic network utilities</u> .	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P2: Adverse effects of network utilities	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.40	Amend	Considers the policy to “avoid, remedy or mitigate” is appropriate to leave scope for other chapters to provide further direction on effects management. However, the policy fails to capture direction from the NPSET for substantial upgrades to be used as opportunity to reduce existing adverse effects (NPSET Policy 6)	Seeks to retain and amend to add opportunities to reduce existing adverse effects  .Add a note or addition to the policy to make clear that the provisions of other chapters (e.g. ECO, NFL, CE, SOSM) will be relevant, and that those more topic- specific provisions should prevail.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P3: Adverse effects of network utilities on protected areas and sites of significance	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.41	Oppose	While specific policy direction on significant sites maybe useful, the management of effects on those sites should be as set out in the chapters identifying these sites, eg the ECO, NFL, CE and SOSM chapters. Effects on significant natural areas (SNAs) should be managed in accordance with the ECO chapter which is not included at this time. It is unclear how these provisions can be applied in the absence of that chapter and plan provisions for the identification of SNAs. The policy focus on upgrades and new development would exclude consideration of adverse effects of operation and maintenance activities. The relationship with NU-P2 is uncertain. Overall the policy does not appear to be needed as Policy NU-P2 provides direction on effects management.	Delete.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P5: Adverse effects of amateur radio configuration	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.42	Oppose	Considers that the policy does not provide adequate management of adverse effects on the environment; the policy is inconsistent with the NZCPS and NPSIB; and the activities already appear to be captured with in Policy NU-P2 as it applies to all “infrastructure”.	Delete or amend to ensure adverse effects on the environment are avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /Policies /NU-P6: Adverse effects of the National Grid Yard and National Grid Corridor	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.43	Amend	State that the word “enable” is not used in the NPSET and could create inconsistencies with the NZCPS and the NPS-IB, including provisions yet to be included in the ECO chapter. The policy fails to capture direction from the NPSET for substantial upgrades to be used as opportunity to reduce existing adverse effects (NPSET Policy 6)	Amend as follows:  <del>Enable</del> <u>Consider providing for</u> major upgrading and development of the National Grid while managing adverse effects on the environment, including by:  Add:  <u>e: using major upgrades as an opportunity to reduce existing adverse effects</u>	Open Submission
NU - Network utilities /General /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.44	Oppose	Arising from late notification of ECO-chapter	Add:  <u>“The Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter includes provisions which relate to network utilities. Where there is a conflict between the Network Utilities chapter and the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter, the provisions that place greater or additional restrictions on activities with adverse effects on the natural environment will apply”</u>	Open Submission

# NU - Network Utilities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NU - Network utilities /NU - Network Utilities - Rules Table /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.45	Oppose	Considers the rules do not ensure adverse effects within the coastal environment are in accordance with the requirements of the NZCPS. In particular the rules do not give effect to Policies 11, 13 and 15 of the NZCPS. The rules also potentially conflict with the ECO chapter provisions and as drafted do not give effect to the NPSIB.	Seeks to add a condition/standard to all rules that the activity is not within the coastal environment, any outstanding waterbody, outstanding NFL or significant natural area. Where this is not complied with the activity must comply with rules in the ECO chapter or is a non-complying activity.	Open Submission

# RE - Renewable Energy

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RE - Renewable energy /Policies	Sera Chambers	150.106	Amend	Considers that the wording should be amended to allow adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for a fifth item to be added to list of things that need to be protected as below: <u>e. adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.</u>	Open Submission
RE - Renewable energy /Issues /RE-I2: Management of adverse effects of renewable energy activities.	James Witham	165.12	Amend	Considers some forms of renewable energy generation can conflict with the effective productive capacity of versatile and highly productive land. Notes that the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land does not provide for new specified infrastructure, including renewable generation, on Highly Productive Land. In addition, the Hawkes Bay Regional Council has identified other pieces of land which are also highly productive and should be included and considers this should be recognised in the issue statement.	Amend RE-I2: Management of adverse effects of renewable energy activities as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission: Amend RE-I2: Management of adverse effects of renewable energy activities Potential adverse effects can include visual amenity and landscape and character impacts, particularly where sited in residential zones or areas with identified significance values <u>including Highly Productive Land and Versatile Land</u> . Some forms of renewable energy generation may also generate nuisance such as noise, vibration, lighting and traffic effects. Sometimes these adverse effects have to be balances alongside recognition any special technical requirements of constraints that may limit where a network utility can be sited.	Open Submission
RE - Renewable energy /Policies /RE-P2: Providing for renewable electricity generation activities.  Relates to RE-O1	James Witham	165.13	Amend	Considers the policy should recognise that some forms of renewable energy generation can conflict with the effective productive capacity of versatile and highly productive land. Also that The National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land does not provide for new specified infrastructure, including renewable generation, on Highly Productive Land.	Amend RE-P2 Providing for renewable electricity generation as as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission: RE-P2 Providing for renewable electricity generation Provide for the identification, investigation, establishment, development, upgrading, operation and maintenance of new and existing renewable electricity generation activities in a manner that supports the protection of: a. Significant natural areas identified in the Plan; b. Outstanding natural features and significant landscape features identified in the plan; c. Sites of significance to Māori identified in the Plan; <del>and</del> d. Historic heritage area, heritage items, and notable trees identified in the Plan; <u>and</u> e. <u>The productive capacity of Highly Productive Land and Versatile Land</u>	Open Submission
RE - Renewable energy /RE - Renewable Energy - Rules Table /RE-R4: Construction and commissioning of new renewable electricity generation activities in all zones and precincts	James Witham	165.14	Amend	Considers that some forms of renewable energy generation can conflict with the effective productive capacity of versatile and highly productive land. Considers the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land does not provide for new specified infrastructure, including renewable generation, on Highly Productive Land and that this land should be protected as required.	Amend RE-R4 Construction and commissioning of new renewable electricity generation activities in all zones and precincts as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission: RE-R4 Construction and commissioning of new renewable electricity generation activities in all zones and precincts RE-R4A Activity Status: Discretionary Where: 1. New renewable electricity generation activities must not be located within a significant natural area, outstanding natural feature, significant landscape features, sites of significance to Māori, and/or historic heritage areas, heritage items and notable trees identified on the Planning Maps and in appendices and schedules; <u>and, Highly Productive Land or Versatile Land</u> RE-R4B Activity Status where activity condition 1 is not met: Non-complying	Open Submission



# RE - Renewable Energy

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RE - Renewable energy /Assessment criteria - Discretionary Activities	James Witham	165.15	Amend	Considers that some forms of renewable energy generation can conflict with the effective productive capacity of versatile and highly productive land. Considers that the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land does not provide for new specified infrastructure, including renewable generation, on Highly Productive Land and this land should be protected as required. Considers that the matters are appropriate for new or expanded renewable energy generation activities, but need not apply to new activities where the relief sought by the submitter regarding non-complying activities is granted.	Amend the Assessment Criteria – Discretionary Activities by Inserting the following criteria as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission: <u>...x. the extent to which the proposal avoids Highly Productive Land and Versatile Land;</u> <u>xx. the extent to which the proposal maintains, the life supporting and productive capacity of Highly Productive Land and Versatile Land.</u>	Open Submission
RE - Renewable energy /General /General	Ellen Robotham	198.43	Support	Generally supportive of the RE – Renewable Energy Chapter. The 2040 Master Plan identified the potential for future development on the western side of the runway, including the possibility of a solar farm as a joint venture, and in consultation with Mana Ahuriri Trust. Many airports around the world are investing in solar installations as an opportunity to reduce the carbon footprint of the airport and to assist airlines with the pending transition to lower emission aircraft (be it through Sustainable Aviation Fuel, hydrogen or electrification). Support the inclusion of the Renewable Energy chapter in the Proposed Plan and provisions which support the development of renewable energy infrastructure in the District. Enabling the development of renewable electricity generation activities in accordance with the National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation 2011 is an essential component of achieving New Zealand’s renewable energy goals. The Government has also signalled that further changes will be made to this policy statement to further accelerate the development of such activities. It provides a clear pathway for the establishment of renewable electricity generation activities across all zones in the District. However, opportunities for greater alignment with the directives of National Policy Statement for Electricity Generation (and any subsequent amendments to those directives) should be considered and included in the proposed RE – Renewable Energy chapter.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
RE - Renewable energy /Issues /RE-I2: Management of adverse effects of renewable energy activities.	Trevor Ellis	253.39	Amend	Renewable energy activities can create and impose adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity, alongside visual amenity and landscape character. Considers that the issue statement should be updated to reflect the potential for adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity.	seeks to amend RE-I1 to acknowledge the potential adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity from some renewable energy activities	Open Submission
RE - Renewable energy /Objectives /RE-O1: Sustainable use and development of renewable energy resources.	Trevor Ellis	253.40	Support	RE-O1 recognises the novelty of renewable energy projects and that adverse effects should be avoided, minimised, and remedied.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
RE - Renewable energy /Policies /RE-P2: Providing for renewable electricity generation activities.	Trevor Ellis	253.41	Amend	Considers that RE-P2 recognises that specific areas of the District are vulnerable to adverse effects that may be caused by renewable energy and should be protected. However, it should still include areas of natural character and indigenous biodiversity as areas that are vulnerable. Natural character cannot be easily recreated / restored along with habitats for indigenous biodiversity.	Seeks to amend as follows:RE-P2: Providing for renewable electricity generation activities Provide for the identification, investigation, establishment, development, upgrading, operation, and maintenance of new and existing renewable electricity generation activities in a manner that supports the protection of: a. significant natural areas identified in the Plan; b. outstanding natural features and significant landscape features identified in the Plan; c. sites of significance to Māori identified in the Plan, and; d. historic heritage areas, heritage items, and notable trees identified in the Plan; <u>e. indigenous biodiversity;</u> <u>f. natural character.</u>	Open Submission
RE - Renewable energy /Policies /RE-P4: Providing for small-scale renewable electricity generation activities.	Trevor Ellis	253.42	Amend	Considers that RE-P4 recognises that specific values in the District are vulnerable to adverse effects that may be caused by renewable energy and should be protected. Considers that the list of values should be expanded to include indigenous biodiversity.	Seeks to amend to add reference to indigenous biodiversity effects enabling them to be assessed where relevant for small scale REG activities.	Open Submission

# RE - Renewable Energy

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RE - Renewable energy /RE - Renewable Energy - Rules Table /RE-R4: Construction and commissioning of new renewable electricity generation activities in all zones and precincts	Trevor Ellis	253.43	Amend	Considers that Rule RE-R4 recognises the novelty of renewable energy projects, and that each application should be considered on its own merits. However, the discretion should be updated to reflect the vulnerable nature of the coastal environment.	Seeks to amend as follows: RE-R4A Activity Status: Discretionary Where: 1. New renewable electricity generation activities must not be located within a significant natural area, outstanding natural feature, outstanding natural character, significant landscape features, <u>an area with significant indigenous biodiversity</u> , sites of significance to Māori, and/or historic heritage areas, heritage items, and notable trees identified on the Planning Maps and in appendices and schedules.	Open Submission
RE - Renewable energy /Objectives /RE-O1: Sustainable use and development of renewable energy resources.  Relates to RE-I1 and RE-I2.	Nichola Nicholson	264.14	Amend	Generally supports the renewable energy provisions however would like to see strengthened direction regarding the resilience of the energy supply and efficient use of energy (inclusive of transport energy) i.e. through appropriately located development and well-designed urban environments and buildings.	Generally supports the renewable energy provisions however would like to see strengthened direction regarding the resilience of the energy supply and efficient use of energy (inclusive of transport energy) i.e. through appropriately located development and well-designed urban environments and buildings.	Open Submission
RE - Renewable energy /Policies /RE-P2: Providing for renewable electricity generation activities.  Relates to RE-O1	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.24	Support	Supports RE - Renewable energy Policy RE-P2: Providing for renewable electricity generation activities as NZPT supports the protection of historic heritage and cultural values in this policy.	Retain RE - Renewable energy Policy RE-P2: Providing for renewable electricity generation activities in its entirety.	Open Submission
RE - Renewable energy /RE - Renewable Energy - Rules Table /RE-R3: Wind monitoring masts in all zones and precincts.	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.25	Amend	Considers that RE - Renewable Energy - Rules Table RE-R3: Wind monitoring masts in all zones and precincts should be amended in Clause 3 to more accurately reference the historic heritage places included in the Plan Schedules.	Amend RE - Renewable Energy - Rules Table RE-R3: Wind monitoring masts in all zones and precincts as follows: 3. Wind monitoring masts must not be located within a significant natural area, outstanding natural feature, significant landscape features, sites of significance to Māori, and/or <del>historic heritage areas</del> , sites containing heritage items, historic heritage precincts or overlays, and notable trees identified on the Planning Maps and in Schedule 1 - Notable Trees, Schedule 2 - Natural Features and Landscapes, Schedule 3 – Historic Heritage items, and Schedule 4 – Historic Heritage Overlay and Precinct, and ...	Open Submission
RE - Renewable energy /RE - Renewable Energy - Rules Table /RE-R4: Construction and commissioning of new renewable electricity generation activities in all zones and precincts	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.26	Amend	Considers that RE - Renewable energy Rule RE-R4: Construction and commissioning of new renewable electricity generation activities in all zones and precincts should be amended to be consistent with the PDP provisions.	Amend RE - Renewable energy Rule RE-R4: Construction and commissioning of new renewable electricity generation activities in all zones and precincts as follows: 1. New renewable electricity generation activities must not be located within ... <del>historic heritage areas</del> <u>overlays and precincts</u> ...	Open Submission
RE - Renewable energy /RE - Renewable Energy /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.33	Amend	Considers the overlap between these chapters makes it very confusing to understand which infrastructure activities are addressed and in which chapter(s) they are addressed. The overlap between provisions in these chapters also makes it unclear how effects are managed and to understand implications for how the ECO provisions may or may not apply to these activities.	Seeks clarification of what activities are addressed in which chapters. Include provisions for infrastructure that is not a “network utility”, “renewable energy generation”, “Stormwater” or “transport”. Rename the section heading or change section names to Energy, Infrastructure and Transport.	Open Submission
RE - Renewable energy /Introduction.	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.46	Amend	Considers it is not clear how this chapter “interrelates” with the Network utility chapter. For example, is this only to the extent that or in circumstances where RE activities may affect network utilities?	Seeks clarification of how and the extent to which the chapter “interrelates” with the NU chapter or amend so that the NU chapter does not apply to RE activities.	Open Submission
RE - Renewable energy /Objectives /RE-O1: Sustainable use and development of renewable energy resources.	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.47	Amend	Considers that the direction on managing adverse effects is inconsistent with s5 and the NPSREG as it fails to include “remedying” adverse effects. Setting direction on how effects are to be managed should sit within policy and provide for specific direction on effects management to come from other chapters including the CE, NFL, ECO and NH chapters.	Amend as follows:  Sustainable use and development of renewable energy resources <del>are encouraged by enabling for</del> <u>renewable electricity generation activities throughout the city, while avoiding, mitigating, or offsetting adverse effects that are more than minor</u> .	Open Submission

# RE - Renewable Energy

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RE - Renewable energy /Policies /RE-P1: Provision for use and development of renewable energy resources.	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.48	Amend	Generally supportive of the contribution renewable electricity generation can make towards addressing effects of climate change. However, it is not clear whether renewable generation activities will need to demonstrate that contribution. Nor is the policy direction clear in term of ensuring that the recognition of benefits for addressing climate change considers impacts of the activity on natural values which may also be addressing effects of climate change. Is concerned that as proposed the consideration of benefits of the renewable electricity generation activity would override or is considered in absences of any consideration of loss of ecosystem function or indigenous biodiversity that may also be of benefit in terms of reducing the impacts of climate change.	Seeks to add policy direction to ensure that the effects of renewable energy generation on natural values that reduce the impacts of climate change are considered when considering the benefits of the activity.	Open Submission
RE - Renewable energy /Policies /RE-P2: Providing for renewable electricity generation activities.  Relates to RE-O1	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.49	Oppose	Considers that the policy is inconsistent with the NZCPS. SNAs are not yet identified in the plan, and not all areas meeting the criteria for significance will necessarily be mapped due to factors such as natural changes and access to private property. Given the loss of, and low level of indigenous vegetation in Napier, even low value indigenous vegetation or areas of exotic vegetation could provide important connectivity and habitat. The plan should include policy direction for protection of all significant indigenous biodiversity whether specifically "identified" in the plan or not. The Ahuriri Estuary Te Whanganui-a-Orotū is an outstanding water body in terms of the NPSFM. The policy is not clear in terms of managing adverse effects of renewable electricity generation activities, nor do other policies capture this.	Amend as follows: Provide for the identification, investigation, establishment, development, upgrading, operation, and maintenance of new and existing renewable electricity generation activities in a manner that: 1. supports the protection of: a. significant natural areas <del>identified in the Plan;</del> b. outstanding natural features and significant landscape features <del>identified in the Plan;</del> c. sites of significance to Māori identified in the Plan, and d. historic heritage areas, heritage items, and notable trees identified in the Plan.; <u>and</u> 2. <u>avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on the environment.</u>	Open Submission
RE - Renewable energy /Policies /RE-P4: Providing for small-scale renewable electricity generation activities.  Relates to RE-O1	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.50	Oppose	Considers that the policy fails to include adequate provision to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the environment.	Amend as follows: Provide for small-scale renewable electricity generation activities <del>and manage their where adverse effects on the environment are so as to avoided, remedied or mitigated adverse effects on the character and amenity of the zone in which they are located.</del>	Open Submission
RE - Renewable energy /General /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.51	Oppose	Opposes the whole chapter, including Introduction, Objectives, Policies and Rules. Arising from late notification of ECO-chapter.	Seeks to add: <u>"The Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter includes provisions which relate to renewable energy. Where there is a conflict between the Renewable Energy chapter and the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter, the provisions that place greater or additional restrictions on activities with adverse effects on the natural environment will apply".</u>	Open Submission
RE - Renewable energy /RE - Renewable Energy - Rules Table /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.52	Oppose	Considers that the rules do not ensure adverse effects within the coastal environment are in accordance with the requirements of the NZCPS. In particular the rules do not give effect to Policies 11, 13 and 15 of the NZCPS. The rules potentially conflict with the ECO chapter provisions.	Seeks to add a condition/standard to all rules that the activity is not within the coastal environment, any outstanding waterbody, outstanding NFL or significant natural area. Where this is not complied with the activity must comply with rules in the ECO chapter or is a non-complying activity.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater /	Lance Simon	27.1	Amend	The submitter considers that the District Plan be amended to reference the desirability of Cross Boundary collaboration between Hastings District Council and Hawkes Bay Regional Council in order to implement Esk River flood protection improvements to protect Bayview residents / infrastructure etc, from future flooding of the Esk River.	The submitter considers that the District Plan be amended to include reference to the desirability of Cross Boundary collaboration between Hastings District Council and Hawke's Bay Regional Council in order to implement Esk River flood protection improvements to protect Bayview residents / infrastructure etc. from future flooding of the Esk River.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Issues /SW-12: Impacts on the receiving environment	Wayne Ormsby	63.7	Amend	Seeks to amend SW-12 to make provision for more nature-based stormwater solutions. Seeks to amend site coverage thresholds to 40% of the development site for all large scale housing and commercial developments. Seeks to include, as a condition of resource consent, nature-based stormwater solutions such as rain gardens and first flush systems. Seeks to work alongside Council and Mana Ahuriri Trust on a Stormwater Strategy.	Amend SW-12 to make provision for more nature-based stormwater solutions. Amend site coverage thresholds to 40% of the development site for all large scale housing and commercial developments. Include, as a condition of resource consent, nature-based stormwater solutions such as rain gardens and first flush systems. Taiwhenua to work alongside Council and Mana Ahuriri Trust on a Stormwater Strategy.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Rules Table	Catherine Hawkins	148.4	Amend	Concerns the increasing flow of stormwater runoff from more intensive housing developments into the Taipo Stream, and the potential this creates to flood nearby homes. Council should consider this potential effect when assessing applications for intensified housing developments and residents should have the opportunity to have a say.	Ensure Council considers runoff into Taipo Stream from housing developments. Enable residents to have a say on intensified housing developments. Minimise hard surfaces for developments where they discharge to the Taipo Stream.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Issues /SW-11: Providing for growth of the city while recognising constraints in the stormwater network	- Angie Denby	149.1	Amend	Amend SW-11 to highlight the need to treat stormwater onsite before it reaches the estuary or the proposed Ahuriri Regional Park. High rise more intense development places pressure on an already stressed stormwater infrastructure system. Council needs to comply with the low impact stormwater techniques used for car park areas. Nutrient loads and toxins are rising in Napier's urban waterways; how we this be addressed and monitored, and how will the toxins from a first flush system be managed? How will Council address the emergency release of sewage to the estuary?	Amend SW-11 to consider matters relating to onsite treatment of stormwater, and recognition of the rising toxin/nutrient levels in urban waterways. Seeks to prevent high density residential development until stormwater can be appropriately managed. Seeks to ensure first flush toxins can be appropriately managed. Requests the re-activation of the UWWG, training for Council engineers on low impact design stormwater solutions, and the prevention of emergency release of sewage into the Ahuriri Estuary.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Rules Table	Tom Anderson	151.41	Amend	Notes that Regulation 57 of NESTF exempts regulated activities from District Plan natural hazard rules because resilience is already factored into industry practice, and they will either avoid hazard areas or engineer structures to be resilient to the hazard risk due to industry practice referred to in the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities) Regulations 2016 Users' Guide Industry practices mean that telecommunication companies rely on local authorities to identify hazards and have resilience requirements. Telecommunication network resilience includes avoiding hazards and designing infrastructure for resilience under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 (CDEMA). Notes that Telecommunication network resilience comes from a variety of ways and is constantly evolving and learning from the events response assessments. Automatic failover arrangements ensure connectivity during emergencies. The Building Code does mandate standards around critical buildings housing telecommunications equipment though design standards for other components of the network, such as mobile facilities, are not prescribed. Crown Infrastructure Partners as part of Government managed initiatives such as ultra-fast (UFB 1 & 2) and rural broadband infrastructure (RBI 1 & 2) rollouts or the Blackspots initiative, does have a prescribed construction standard. Although there is no network construction standard outside those contractually managed by Crown Infrastructure Partners, the telecommunication companies constantly review their networks. Regulatory oversight includes Commerce Commission monitoring and MBIE regulations. Some councils, like Kaikoura, have accepted the exemption of telecommunication networks from further regulation.Consistency between NESTF regulated activities and other telecommunication activities should be maintained by exempting telecommunication networks from stormwater provisions in the PDP. Refer to original submission for full details	Amend the rule so that it clearly exempts activities associated with telecommunication networks as follows:  <u>This rule do not apply to activities associated with telecommunication networks.</u>	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Policies /SW-P1: Onsite detention in existing urban areas with a connection to a public stormwater network	Sheena McGuire	168.47	Support	Supports provisions for on-site stormwater management to pre- development levels or connection to the public reticulated system. Seek to ensure neighbouring development does not result in stormwater discharge onto the rail corridor which can compromise the safe and efficient operation of the rail network.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Policies /SW-P3: Overland flow paths	Sheena McGuire	168.48	Support	Supports policy direction to maintain overland flow path capacity to ensure stormwater flows safely without causing damage to property including rail infrastructure.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SW - Stormwater /Objectives /SW-01: Public health and safety	Susan Elaine Macdonald	178.2	Amend	Disagrees with the rezoning of Napier South and Marewa to High Density Residential Zone. Despite proposed upgrades of stormwater, submitter has concerns that stormwater run-off from extra housing will overload stormwater infrastructure. Notes that 70% of Napier's stormwater runs into Ahuriri Estuary, housing infill will increase this. Concerned with the level of treatment of stormwater before it enters the estuary. Higher and more dense buildings will spoil the aesthetics of the suburbs. Seeks that consents for buildings in the HDR Zone be notifiable. Supports the proposed fencing rules as lower fences allow people on the footpath to see when vehicles are coming out of properties.	Relief Sought is not included, however it is inferred that the submitter seeks that the proposal to rezone Napier South and Marewa HRZ be rejected.  It is also inferred that the submitter seeks that buildings within the HRZ be notifiable.  It is also inferred that the submitter seeks the approval of the proposal relating to front fences.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Rules Table	Cameron Drury	179.5	Oppose	The number of car parks should not trigger the need for consent. Requiring resource consent for any carpark more than 10 spaces is an inefficient method to achieve stormwater quality objectives. Further, there are no standards to measure compliance with (2) against. There is no clarity as to what would be an "approved" stormwater management device.	Delete rule. Consider if outcomes are best achieved through the Stormwater Bylaw or Code of Practice rather than a resource consent process. Alternatively, amend the rule to remove the 10 car park trigger for consent and improve clarity on the expected stormwater treatment.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Rules Table	Cameron Drury	179.6	Amend	The current drafting of the rule effectively requires roads designed to accommodate less than 5,000 vehicle per day to seek resource consent under SW-R2B. Further, there are no standards to measure compliance with (2) against.	Delete rule and consider if outcomes are best achieved through the Stormwater Bylaw or Code of Practice. Alternatively, amend rule to improve clarity of when permitted activity conditions would be met.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Standards Table	Cameron Drury	179.19	Amend	Significant loss of land and cost for larger development. There needs to be balance between private and public response, and options for when on-site solutions are not a practicable option.  Implementation under (5) is not possible without subdivision.	Amend	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Assessment criteria /SW-AC1: All activities requiring consent in this chapter	Cameron Drury	179.22	Amend	Significant and costly expert assessment would be required to satisfy many of the criteria – increasing resource consenting costs. Too greater / onerous assessment on the wider environment being imposed on individual resource consent applicants.	Review and focus the criteria	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Rules Table	Mark Leggett	180.3	Oppose	Considers and disputes the applicability of Rule SW-R5 and Standard SW-1 to PORTZ Zone sites given their proximity to the receiving environment, absence of connection to the wider stormwater network and the low likelihood that they are contributors to flood risk. Considers on-site retention impractical in intensely developed environment and that on-site detention serves no purpose. Notes that impervious surface limits are not imposed for PORTZ Zone, unlike in other regions like in Aucklands Unitary Plan. Notes that the section 32 report gives cursory consideration to specific stormwater management areas, favoring a broad-brush approach. Considers that the blanket imposition of such controls fails to account for the specific characteristics of areas such as the Port. Seeks exemption from Rule SW-R5 and Standard SW-1with respect to sites located in the PORTZ Zone.	<b>Amend</b> Rule SW-R5 and Standard SW-1 to include (in both instances) the following exemption:  <u>'This rule / standard does not apply to sites located in the PORTZ – Port Zone.'</u>	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Standards Table	Mark Leggett	180.4	Oppose	Considers and disputes the applicability of Rule SW-R5 and Standard SW-S1 to PORTZ Zone sites given their proximity to the receiving environment, absence of connection to the wider stormwater network and the low likelihood that they are contributors to flood risk. Considers on-site retention impractical in intensely developed environment and that on-site detention serves no purpose. Notes that impervious surface limits are not imposed for PORTZ Zone, unlike in other regions like in Aucklands Unitary Plan. Notes that the section 32 report gives cursory consideration to specific stormwater management areas, favoring a broad-brush approach. Considers that the blanket imposition of such controls fails to account for the specific characteristics of areas such as the Port. Seeks exemption from Rule SW-R5 and Standard SW-1with respect to sites located in the PORTZ Zone.	<b>Amend</b> Rule SW-R5 and Standard SW-S1 to include (in both instances) the following exemption:  <u>'This rule / standard does not apply to sites located in the PORTZ – Port Zone.'</u>	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Standards Table	Angela McFlynn	189.7	Oppose	The submitter considers the Permitted Activity Standard will be unable to be complied with for any new development and / or redevelopment of land that is not also subject to a subdivision consent, as it is not possible for a consent notice to be registered on a title outside of the subdivision process. The requirements as a whole are considered excessive and likely cost-prohibitive for minor site works, such as new footpaths or outdoor paved areas, and if strictly enforced would ultimately lead to the decline of amenity as property owners would not undertake property maintenance works that involved the development and / or redevelopment of impervious surfaces.	Delete Standard SW-S1: Hydraulic mitigation, and consequentially also amend Rule SW-R5: Any development of new or redevelopment of existing impervious areas to reflect that this Standard has been deleted.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Issues /SW-I1: Providing for growth of the city while recognising constraints in the stormwater network	Darryl Furness	200.6	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) especially the zoning of Elbourne street, due to directly effecting the submitter. Is against the proposal as due its impact on the health and wellbeing of residents.  Has concerns of increased noise, loss of character, increased traffic, parking, loss of trees and greenspace, sunlight, privacy, loss of community, increased anti-social behaviour, the capability of wastewater systems, and liquefaction risk.  Also mentions the healthcare system and its ability to cope with an increased population.Has concerns about current wastewater systems ability to cope now, referring to Cyclone Gabrielle. Increased population will exacerbate an already big issue.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SW - Stormwater /Policies /SW-P6: Operation and maintenance	Grant Russell	202.10	Oppose	Considers SW - Stormwater SW-P6: Operation and maintenance reference to 'in perpetuity' is inappropriate. Meeting required performance standards is considered a more practical timebound measure.	Amend SW - Stormwater SW-P6: Operation and maintenance as follows:  Require onsite stormwater management methods including detention tanks, raingardens, and stormwater filters to be:  a. maintained <del>in perpetuity</del> to ensure the required performance standard is achieved.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Rules Table	Grant Russell	202.11	Amend	Considers SW-R2: Development of new or redevelopment of existing roads or state highways requires further clarification of the stormwater management device lifespan in the wording.	Amend SW-R2: Development of new or redevelopment of existing roads or state highways as follows:  3. The approved stormwater management device must be maintained in good working order for the <del>life-specified manufacturing date</del> of the device.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Assessment criteria /SW-AC1: All activities requiring consent in this chapter	Grant Russell	202.12	Oppose	The submitter considers they want to be consulted with as to how SW-AC1 relates with the NCC Stormwater Bylaw 2020 in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of process.	Seeks consultation with NCC as to how SW-AC1 relates with the NCC Stormwater Bylaw 2020 in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of process.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Assessment criteria /SW-AC2: Low impact design	Grant Russell	202.13	Oppose	The submitter considers they want to be consulted with as to how SW-AC2 relates with the NCC Stormwater Bylaw 2020 in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of process.	Seeks consultation with NCC as to how SW-AC2: Low impact design relates with the NCC Stormwater Bylaw 2020 in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of process.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Introduction /General	Georgina McPherson	215.49	Amend	It would assist plan users in the introduction to further clarify the relationship between the approval processes under these documents, particularly approval processes under the District Plan and Bylaw and whether these are intended to work in tandem, or provide an alternative pathway and whether applicants should seek approval under either the District Plan or Stormwater Bylaw first or at the same time. It would also assist plan users to provide additional clarification of the distinction between activities that will be subject to regulation at a district level and at a regional level. There is duplication with regional plan requirements and any such duplication is opposed as inappropriate and unnecessary.	Amend the introduction to the stormwater chapter to provide further guidance to plan users on the relationship between:  - the District Plan, Napier City Council Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure, and the Napier City Council Stormwater Bylaw in managing stormwater, and the anticipated application process; and  the new stormwater management provisions in the Proposed Plan and those already contained in the Hawke's Bay Regional Resource Management Plan (RRMP) and to clarify that stormwater discharges from industrial and trade premises are appropriately regulated under the RRMP with no need to duplicate the regulation of discharges from such sites at a district level through the Proposed Plan.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Objectives /SW-O1: Public health and safety	Georgina McPherson	215.50	Support	The Fuel Companies support the intent of SW-O1 and seek that it is retained as notified.	Retain SW-O1 as notified.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Objectives /SW-O3: Receiving environment	Georgina McPherson	215.51	Amend	While the intent of the objective is acknowledged, the requirement in clause a) to entirely avoid further degradation of receiving environments is opposed as too absolute and unlikely to be able to be achieved.	Amend SW-O3 to remove the requirement for absolute avoidance of the degradation of receiving environments. This could be achieved by amending the wording as follows or with changes to the same effect:  SW-O3: Receiving environmentStormwater discharges into Napier's stormwater network are managed to:  a. <del>avoid</del> <u>slow the rate of</u> further degradation of theecological health of the network's receiving environments; b. progressively improve the mauri of freshwater and coastal water in the network's receiving environments over time to enable traditional and cultural use of this resource by mana whenua, and c. assist Napier City Council in meeting the requirements of its comprehensive networkdischarge consent for the stormwater network.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SW - Stormwater /Policies /SW-P1: Onsite detention in existing urban areas with a connection to a public stormwater network	Georgina McPherson	215.52	Amend	The intent of the policy is supported. However, the wording should be amended to clarify that it applies only to development and redevelopment of impervious areas within a site, being the parts of a site from which stormwater runoff will occur.	Amend SW-P1 to clarify that it applies to development or redevelopment of impervious areas of a site only, using the term 'redevelopment of impervious area' as defined in the plan. This could be achieved by making the following changes or to the same effect:  SW-P1 Onsite detention in existing urban areas with a connection to a public stormwater network  Stormwater quantity is efficiently managed by requiring on site stormwater attenuation to pre-development levels for any development or redevelopment of <u>impervious areas on a site</u> that has a connection to a public stormwater network.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Policies /SW-P3: Overland flow paths	Georgina McPherson	215.53	Amend	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this policy, however request that the conditions are amended to clarify that this rule relates only to new buildings and structures.	Retain SW-P3.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Policies /SW-P4: Low impact design	Georgina McPherson	215.54	Amend	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this policy; however, they note that the technical or operational requirements of some activities may mean it is not possible to minimize impervious areas to the extent possible.	Amend SW-P4 as follows:  SW-P4: Low impact design  Where resource consent is required for subdivision, new buildings, and/or multi-unit development, manage stormwater run-off at source and through low-impact design techniques including: a. minimisation of impervious areas <u>to the extent practicable</u> ; b. retention of natural vegetation and green spaces; c. selection of plant species appropriate for the climate; d. replication of natural processes such as the filtering properties of soils and vegetation; e. improvement of biodiversity and other values, and f. treatment of first-flush through natural and/or engineered methods before discharge to the network.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Policies /SW-P5: Roofs, car parks, and roads	Georgina McPherson	215.55	Amend	Clause b of SW-P5 refers to treating runoff from new large-scale open car parks and roads accommodating high volumes of traffic. The wording does not reflect the associated rules (SW-R1 and SW-R2) which also apply to redevelopment of these areas. Nor is there any certainty as to the scale of the areas to which the policy is intended to apply, albeit it is assumed the intent is to align with the thresholds set out in rules SW-R1 and SW-R2.	Amend Policy SW-P5 to provide greater certainty as the types of activities to which it is intended to apply. This could be achieved by making amendments along the following lines:  SW-P5: Roofs, car parks, and roads  Minimise contaminants in stormwater being discharged to the reticulated stormwater network by: a. requiring inert roofing materials and restricting the use of inert and toxic materials and paints on roofs, and b. requiring treatment of run-off from <del>new large-scale open-uncovered</del> car parks of more than 20 spaces and roads designed to accommodate more than 5,000 vehicles per day during construction or redevelopment <del>high volumes of traffic</del> .	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Rules Table	Georgina McPherson	215.56	Amend	The Fuel Companies are not opposed to the treatment of stormwater run-off from uncovered car parking areas. However, the threshold of 10 car park spaces proposed by Rule SW-R1 is considered too low for a rule that would apply generally to all car parking areas across the district. There is no evidence base for the selection of this threshold. Plan Change 9 to the Hawke's Bay Regional Resource Management Plan (RRMP) has introduced specific consenting requirements for the discharge of stormwater from industrial or trade premises (Rule TANK 24 in the decisions version of PC9), including implementation of a Stormwater Management Plan in accordance with Schedule 33 of the RRMP that addresses stormwater treatment devices. Avoid unnecessary duplication. There are additional uncertainties in the requirements eg what is an appropriate stormwater management device. See full submission for more detail.	<p>Amend SW-R1 to increase the threshold at which stormwater treatment is required from 10 to 20 car parking spaces and to clarify;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the thresholds expected to be achieved by the stormwater treatment device;</li> <li>- that the rule applies to discharges to the reticulated network only;</li> <li>- that activities otherwise excluded from the definition of 'redevelopment of impervious areas' are also excluded from this rule.</li> </ul> <p>This could be achieved by making the following changes or changes to the same effect:            SW-R1: Development of new or redevelopment of existing uncovered car parks <u>where stormwater discharge is to the reticulated stormwater network</u>            SW-R1A Activity Status: Permitted            Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The car park provides for no more than <del>ten</del> <u>twenty</u> car park spaces, or</li> <li>2. Stormwater run-off from the total impervious area of the carpark and access ways must be treated by an <del>approved</del> <u>approved-authorized</u> stormwater management device designed to accommodate and treat stormwater from the uncovered car park <del>remove sediments and contaminants</del> prior to discharge into the stormwater network, and <del>or</del></li> <li>3. The <del>approved-authorized</del> stormwater management device must be maintained in good working order for the life of the device; and</li> <li>4. <u>The device or system must be sized and designed in accordance with 'Guidance Document 2017/001 Stormwater Management Devices in the Auckland Region (GD01)'; or</u></li> <li>5. <u>Where alternative devices are proposed, the device the device must demonstrate it is designed to achieve an equivalent level of contaminant</u></li> </ol> <p><u>or sediment removal performance to that of 'Guidance Document 2017/001 Stormwater Management Devices in the Auckland Region (GD01)';</u></p> <p><u>except that Rule SW-R1 does not apply to the following activities:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i <u>Stormwater discharges from industrial or trade premises that are otherwise regulated by the Hawke's Bay Regional Resource Management Plan; and</u></li> <li>ii <u>Activities that are otherwise excluded from the definition of redevelopment of impervious area as follows:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>Maintenance or repairs that do not increase the total impervious area of the site, or result in any additional contaminant discharge;</u></li> <li>b. <u>Resurfacing that does not involve the re- direction of existing stormwater flows or drainage networks;</u></li> <li>c. <u>Trenching and resurfacing associated with the installation, maintenance, repair and replacement of underground equipment, infrastructure or underground utility works</u></li> <li>d. <u>Installation, maintenance, repair or upgrade of above ground network utilities, including electric vehicle charging facilities, having a gross floor area of no more than 3.5m<sup>2</sup>.</u></li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Rules Table	Georgina McPherson	215.57	Amend	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this rule, however, seek that it be clarified that this applies to 'new' buildings, structure and earthworks. The wording of this rule currently has no distinction between new or existing buildings, so suggests that it captures existing buildings and structures which have been lawfully established.	<p>Amend SW-R3 as follows:</p> <p>SW-R3:NewBuildings, structures, and earthworks on sites with overland flow paths</p> <p>Activity status: Permitted            Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The existing entry and exit points of the overland flow path through the site are maintained and remain unobstructed, and</li> <li>2. <del>The</del> <u>Any new</u> building, structure, or earthworks will not decrease the capacity of the overland flow path entering the site or increase the volume of overland flow path exiting the site.</li> </ol>	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Rules Table	Georgina McPherson	215.58	Support	The Fuel Companies are supportive of SW-R4 and seek that it is retained as notified.	Retain SW-R4 as notified.	Open Submission



Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Rules Table	Georgina McPherson	215.59	Amend	<p>As identified in relation to SW-R1, the Fuel Companies seek to ensure the threshold at which the trigger for implementation of hydraulic mitigation is set is reasonable and represents an efficient use of resources, particularly where it relates to retrofitting of mitigation measures to existing impermeable areas. As currently drafted, the rule will be triggered for any redevelopment of existing impervious surfaces, as there is no clear link to the defined term 'redevelopment of existing impervious areas', which provides some limited exclusions. As a minimum, the rule should be amended to clarify that activities that are excluded from the definition of redevelopment of impervious areas will not trigger the hydraulic mitigation requirements of Rule SW-R5 and SW-S1.</p> <p>Further, as currently drafted, SW-R1 will trigger a requirement to implement the hydraulic mitigation measures set out in SW-S1 for the creation of any new impervious surfaces, even as little as 1m2, across the entire district, or obtain a Restricted Discretionary activity consent where the hydraulic mitigation requirements of SW-S1 are not met. This threshold is considered too low and unduly onerous. It is also considered the rule should be amended to clarify whether or not it applies to the development of new or redevelopment of existing impervious surfaces associated with new or existing roads or state highways.</p>	<p>Amend SW-R5 as follows:                      SW-R5: Any development of new or redevelopment of existing impervious areas where stormwater is <u>discharged to the reticulated stormwater network</u>                      SW-R5A                      Activity Status: Permitted                      Where:                      1. <u>The activity involves development of new or redevelopment of existing impervious areas up to 50m2; or</u>                      2. <u>The maximum impervious area standard for the relevant zone or precinct is met, and</u>                      2. <u>Development of new or redevelopment of existing impervious areas greater than 50m2 meets standard SW-S1 except that Rule SW-R5 does not apply to the following activities:</u>                      i <u>Activities that are otherwise excluded from the definition of redevelopment of impervious area as follows:</u>                      a. <u>Maintenance or repairs that do not increase the total impervious area of the site, or result in any additional contaminant discharge;</u>                      b. <u>Resurfacing that does not involve the re- direction of existing stormwater flows or drainage networks;</u>                      c. <u>Trenching and resurfacing associated with the installation, maintenance, repair and replacement of underground equipment, infrastructure or underground utility works</u>                      d. <u>Installation, maintenance, repair or upgrade of above ground network utilities, including electric vehicle charging facilities, having a gross floor area of no more than 3.5m2.</u>                      Note: <u>For the avoidance of doubt, Rule SW-R5 applies to any development of new or redevelopment of impervious surfaces associated with new or existing roads or state highways.</u></p>	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Standards Table	Georgina McPherson	215.60	Amend	<p>The Fuel Companies have a number of concerns with SW-S1 (See full submission for more detail). The approach recommended in the Napier City Stormwater Master Plan 2020 Stantec report as fit-for purpose and consider Clause 2 should be amended to reflect this recommendation, noting that no technical justification is provided for the wording currently proposed in Clause 2. Clause 3 requirements don't provide for a comprehensive approach to managing stormwater, such as may be provided as part of a subdivision or integrated development, where stormwater runoff from a number of different properties is managed in a comprehensive manner. Clauses 4 ii), iii) and iv) all make reference to quality treatment. These requirements are inappropriate in the context of a standard that has the specific purpose of managing stormwater quantity and should be deleted. The requirement to register the ongoing maintenance and operation of stormwater management devices on titles is considered unnecessary and unduly onerous.</p>	<p>Amend SW-S1 to address the concerns raised by the Fuel Companies and provide greater certainty and clarity as to the purpose and effect of the standard. This could be achieved by making changes along the following lines:</p> <p>SW-S1: Hydraulic mitigation                      All sites with a connection to a public stormwater network                      1. Provide retention (volume reduction) of at least 10 mm runoff depth for the impervious area for which hydrology mitigation is required (refer to Figure 1).                      2. <del>Provide detention (temporary storage) and a drain down period of 24 hours for the difference between the pre-development and post-development run-off volumes from the 10% AEP, 24-hour rainfall event (refer to Figure 3 below, Table 9 of the Napier City Council Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure*) minus the 10-mm retention volume or any greater retention volume that is achieved over the impervious area for which hydrology mitigation is required</del> Stormwater runoff generated from development in a 1 in 10- year rainfall event with a 24-hour duration, should be detained on-site and discharged to the public stormwater network in a manner that it is limited to the pre-development peak runoff rate (refer to Figure 2).                       *Note: As at August 2021, the rainfall depth for the 10% AEP 24 hour duration event is 139 mm.                       3. All retention and detention to be provided:                      (i) within the site boundary; or                      (ii) <u>by an authorised off-site stormwater management device or system where the system is designed, constructed and operated to receive and manage stormwater from the impervious area of the site.</u></p>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
					<p>A copy of the authorisation (such as a discharge consent or subdivision consent notice on title) must be provided to the Council, along with confirmation from the operator of the device or system that hydrology mitigation requirements will be achieved for the additional stormwater from the site.</p> <p>4. Where stormwater management devices including stormwater detention and/or retention tanks are provided, 'as built plans' for the device or system together with an operation and maintenance plan is required to be lodged with, and approved by Napier City Council that addresses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>how the whole site and specific equipment/features are operated and maintained with respect to stormwater;</li> <li><del>personnel responsibilities, treatment method(s), treatment requirements;</del></li> <li><del>mitigation of pollutants (gross, soluble, and suspended);</del></li> <li>location(s) of retention and detention devices treatment and conveyance systems;</li> <li>the maintenance schedule for the specific equipment/feature included on the site;</li> <li>the design parameters and limitations of the specific equipment/features, and</li> <li>the design calculations for the specific equipment/features.</li> </ol> <p>5. <del>The operation and maintenance manual will be enforced through a consent notice on the title to ensure future property owners are aware of the maintenance obligations for the stormwater management device. Any stormwater management device or system must be operated and maintained in accordance with best practice for the device or system.</del></p> <p>6. For the purpose of this standard, the impervious area for which hydrology mitigation is required is any new or redeveloped impervious area undertaken since the date this rule becomes operative.</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Purpose of the standard;</li> <li>Public health and safety;</li> <li>Network efficiency and resilience;</li> <li>Receiving environment values, and</li> <li>Use of low impact design, and</li> <li><u>The practicality and limitations of applying hydraulic mitigation to the site taking into account site and operational constraints, the requirements for other utilities or infrastructure.</u></li> </ol>	
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Standards Table	Georgina McPherson	215.61	Support	The Fuel Companies are supportive of SW-S2 and seek that it is retained as notified.	Retain SW-S2 as notified.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Assessment criteria /SW-AC1: All activities requiring consent in this chapter	Georgina McPherson	215.62	Amend	The Fuel Companies support the intent of the Assessment Criteria under SW-AC1. However, the wording specifies that the criteria apply to all activities requiring consent in this chapter. It is important to ensure the wording of the assessment criteria does not require assessment against a criterion that is no relevant to the matter for which consent is required.	<p>Amend the wording of SW-AC1 to ensure activities requiring consent only need to be assessed against matters of relevance to the reason for consent. This could be achieved by making changes along the following lines:</p> <p>Assessment criteria SW-C1: All activities requiring consent in this chapter ...</p> <p>Effects on the values of the receiving environment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>Whether</del> The extent to which any and nature of contaminants generated from the an activity for which management of stormwater quality is required will: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>adversely affect the ecological, cultural and recreational values of the stormwater network's receiving environments, and/or</li> <li>affect the ability for Napier City Council to meet the conditions of its comprehensive stormwater network discharge consent.</li> </ol> </li> <li>The extent to which <del>the any</del> stormwater management device(s) proposed will be effective in removing the anticipated contaminants from the activity.</li> <li>The proposed methods for operating and maintaining <del>the any proposed</del> stormwater treatment processes and devices to ensure their continued and ongoing effectiveness in removing contaminants.</li> <li>The proposed methods for monitoring and reporting on the effectiveness of <del>the any proposed</del> treatment process.</li> </ol>	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Issues /SW-I1: Providing for growth of the city while recognising constraints in the stormwater network	Murray and Elly Buchanan	237.3	Oppose	Opposes the introduction of medium and high density residential zones. The existing SW network cannot cope with current levels of development and the SW it generates. Notes that with the change of government the Acts are being repealed while the NPS, if not also withdrawn, the inclusion of medium and high density zones to satisfy the requirements of the National Policy Statement is to be made voluntary for Councils to adopt.	Delete all the medium and high density residential provisions and replace with the existing residential zones.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SW - Stormwater /Objectives /SW-02: Network efficiency	Maryanne Macintosh	243.5	Oppose	<p>Many Schools within MRZ are already up to capacity, submitter states children need space. Has concerns of Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) impacting quality of life. Living in an attractive environment with greenspace is important to people's well-being.</p> <p>Infrastructure is another concern, with reference to stormwater during the cyclone. Notes, Singapore's requirements for greenspaces, flooding of streets, grass is needed for water drainage, and a geyser in Elbourne Street.Considers safety of elderly important, with reference to break ins. Submitter states MRZ and HRZ makes it harder to know neighbours, creating a loss of connection.</p>	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Objectives /SW-03: Receiving environment	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.25	Support	Supports Objective SW-03: Receiving environment as the outcomes sought by this objective, in terms of striving to improve the quality of receiving environments that receive stormwater from the city's reticulated stormwater network, in accordance with the requirements of the Council's comprehensive network discharge consent, are appropriate.	Retain Objective SW-03 as notified.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Policies /SW-P1: Onsite detention in existing urban areas with a connection to a public stormwater network	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.26	Support	Supports Policy SW-P1: Onsite detention in existing urban areas with a connection to a public stormwater network as in the context of the risks associated with rainfall, particularly heavy rainfall, requiring rainfall / stormwater attenuation as proposed by this policy is considered appropriate.	Retain Policy SW-P1 as notified in its entirety.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Policies /SW-P2: Stormwater management in greenfield growth areas	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.27	Support	Supports SW-P2: Stormwater management in greenfield growth areas as this policy is likely to apply to stormwater management in the expanded industrial area sought by Ravensdown at Awatoto. It is appropriate as it recognises that onsite, or standalone, stormwater solutions can be established to support further development (Clause (b)(ii) of this Policy).	Retain Policy SW-P2 as notified.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Policies /SW-P3: Overland flow paths	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.28	Support	Supports Policy SW-P3: Overland flow paths as Overland flow paths are identified in the PDP as being associated with Ravensdown's Awatoto landholdings. In the context of the risks associated with rainfall, particularly heavy rainfall, requiring the maintenance of the capacity of these flow paths to pass stormwater flows safely is a sensible and appropriate approach.	Retain Policy SW-P3 as notified.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Policies /SW-P4: Low impact design	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.29	Amend	<p>Considers Policy SW-P4: Low impact design should be amended as there are two parts of this policy that need to be addressed further, namely Clauses (e) and (f) as discussed below.</p> <p>The policy relates to putting in place at source low-impact design solutions for stormwater. Clause (e), which refers to improving biodiversity and other values, is not consistent with the policy approach (or the structure of the policy). For this reason, this clause of the policy should be deleted. In relation to Clause (f), while supporting the proposed technique of providing for first-flush treatment of stormwater, via natural or engineered methods, the subsequent sole reference to discharging stormwater to a network does not reflect all of the options that available. As recognised by Policy SW-P2, the discharge of stormwater from a standalone system is also an option.</p>	<p>Amend Policy SW-P4 as follows:</p> <p>Where resource consent is required for subdivision, new buildings, and/or multi-unit development, manage stormwater run-off at source and through low-impact design techniques including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>minimisation of impervious areas;</li> <li>retention of natural vegetation and green spaces;</li> <li>selection of plant species appropriate for the climate;</li> <li>replication of natural processes such as the filtering properties of soils and vegetation; and</li> <li>improvement of biodiversity and other values, and treatment of first-flush through natural and/or engineered methods before discharge to the network <u>or from a standalone system.</u></li> </ol>	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Policies /SW-P5: Roofs, car parks, and roads	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.30	Support	Supports SW-P5: Roofs, car parks, and roads with an amendment as while supporting this policy, it is considered that the reference to discharging stormwater to a network does not reflect all of the options that are available. As recognised by Policy SW-P2, the discharge of stormwater from a standalone system is also an option.	<p>Amend Policy SW-P5 as follows:</p> <p>Minimise contaminants in stormwater being discharged to the reticulated stormwater network <u>or from standalone systems</u> by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>requiring inert roofing materials and restricting the use of inert and toxic materials and paints on roofs, and</li> <li>requiring treatment of run-off from new large-scale open car parks and roads designed to accommodate high volumes of traffic.</li> </ol>	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Policies /SW-P6: Operation and maintenance	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.31	Support	The submitter supports Policy SW-P6: Operation and maintenance as it is agreed that where stormwater management methods are present within a site, they should be maintained and operational at all times, as required by this Policy.	Retain Policy SW-P6 as notified.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Rules Table	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.32	Support	Supports SW - Stormwater - Rules Table Rule SW-R3: Buildings, structures, and earthworks on sites with overland flow paths as Overland flow paths are identified on the PDP's planning maps as being present on Ravensdown's landholdings at Awatoto. In this context, providing for development where overland flow paths are located as a permitted activity, subject to complying with the conditions proposed, is appropriate.	Retain Rule SW-R3 in its entirety as notified.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Rules Table	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.33	Support	Supports Rule SW-R4: New buildings or any alteration to buildings as these provisions are an appropriate matter to consider when new buildings are being constructed or when existing buildings are being altered.	Retain Rule SW-R4 as notified.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Rules Table	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.34	Support	Supports SW-R5: Any development of new or redevelopment of existing impervious areas as this Rule framework is supported, particularly given the definition of 'redevelopment of impervious areas', which clarifies that redevelopment of such areas includes the replacement or reconstruction of a site's lawfully established impervious area provided there is no increase in area, no additional contaminants or the re-redirecting of existing stormwater flows or drainage networks.	Retain Rule SW-R5 as notified.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Standards Table	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.35	Support	Supports SW - Stormwater - Standards Table Standard SW-S1: Hydraulic mitigation as in relation to Rule SW-R5, this standard and the associated rule framework are supported.	Retain Standard SW-S1 as notified.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Standards Table	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.36	Support	Supports Standard SW-S2: Inert roofing as discussed above in relation to Rule SW-R4, this standard is supported.	Retain Standard SW-S2 as notified.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Policies /SW-P4: Low impact design	Trevor Ellis	253.44	Support	Supports as SW-P4 gives effect to the NPS-FM and NPS-IB.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Objectives /SW-O1: Public health and safety	Nichola Nicholson	264.12	Support	Supports the PDP's three stormwater-related objectives (SW-01, SW-02 and SW-03) and generally support the associated policies. As a consent authority, HBRC has granted discharge permits to the City Council for the collection, treatment and discharge of stormwater at various locations around the City. Wastewater contaminant overflows into the Ahuriri Estuary is particularly problematic. It is good to see that provisions in the PDP are aiming to support network improvements and better environmental outcomes for the highly valued Ahuriri Estuary.	No relief sought.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Objectives /SW-O2: Network efficiency	Nichola Nicholson	264.19	Support	Supports the PDP's three stormwater-related objectives (SW-01, SW-02 and SW-03) and generally support the associated policies. As a consent authority, HBRC has granted discharge permits to the City Council for the collection, treatment and discharge of stormwater at various locations around the City. Wastewater contaminant overflows into the Ahuriri Estuary is particularly problematic. It is good to see that provisions in the PDP are aiming to support network improvements and better environmental outcomes for the highly valued Ahuriri Estuary.	No relief sought.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Objectives /SW-O3: Receiving environment	Nichola Nicholson	264.20	Support	Supports the PDP's three stormwater-related objectives (SW-01, SW-02 and SW-03) and generally support the associated policies. As a consent authority, HBRC has granted discharge permits to the City Council for the collection, treatment and discharge of stormwater at various locations around the City. Wastewater contaminant overflows into the Ahuriri Estuary is particularly problematic. It is good to see that provisions in the PDP are aiming to support network improvements and better environmental outcomes for the highly valued Ahuriri Estuary.	No relief sought	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /General /General	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.39	Amend	Acknowledges that Council seeks to manage the effects of land use development on the quality of the stormwater network, including discharge both into and out of this network. Notes that the state highway network across the region is extensive. The state highway stormwater infrastructure is designed for the capacity of this network only. Notes that its state highway stormwater network is therefore not designed to meet the demand of stormwater discharged from adjoining land use development. NZTA cannot accept responsibility for the discharge of contaminants by third parties into its network. Seeks for Council to ensure that stormwater is managed to ensure it does not compromise the state highway stormwater network.	Seeks for Council to manage land use development to meet the following requirement: <u>All stormwater runoff from impervious areas of adjoining property to a state highway is managed onsite at all times and does not enter the state highway network.</u>	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Rules Table	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.40	Oppose	Opposes due to concerns over the implication of the application of this rule on the existing state highway network within Napier. NZTA have designations in place for maintenance and operations of the state highway network which would preclude us from this rule.	Excludes state highway urban carriageways where the runoff is discharged into the Napier City stormwater network.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SW - Stormwater /Policies /SW-P4: Low impact design	Vanessa Moon	282.5	Support	Supports Stormwater SW-P4 Low Impact Design in the PDP, emphasizing minimization of impervious surfaces, retention of natural vegetation, selection of climate-appropriate plant species, replication of natural processes, enhancement of biodiversity, and treatment of first flush before discharge to the network.	<p>Submitter proposes the following options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Implementing a system of open stormwater ditches to increase stormwater holding capacity in Jervoistown, potentially planted with appropriate vegetation for water filtration.</li> <li>- Creating detention tanks with wetland plantings, possibly utilizing undeveloped sections like Napier Street.</li> <li>- Replacing asphalt roads with permeable surfaces and lowering speed limits to 40 kph within Jervoistown.</li> <li>- Encouraging property owners to install retention tanks, soak pits, replace hard surfaces with landscaped areas, and plant gardens with native and exotic plants for cooling, flood mitigation, and biodiversity.</li> <li>- Considering locations for community gardens and urban farms in Jervoistown.</li> <li>- Exploring alternative waste management methods, such as composting toilets, with a system for composting waste and utilizing resulting products for agricultural purposes.</li> </ul> <p>Notes their vision for Jervoistown: Foster community, biodiversity, climate-resilient water management, green Napier, and local food source. No specific relief sought. Refer to original submission for full details.</p>	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Standards Table	Kainga Ora - Brendon Liggett	285.23	Amend	Support the use of engineering techniques and the attenuation of stormwater on-site to control the potential effects of development on the stormwater network and the surrounding environment. However, the requirement to provide for retention systems (SW-S1), fails to acknowledge that this is just one potential solution for attenuation.	<p>Amend so that any requirement for retention be included as one solution but not necessarily the solution; i.e. soakage and detention systems could also be utilised to address potential effects of development.</p> <p>Any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the changes highlighted above or in the appendices attached.</p>	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Policies /General	Son Nguyen	287.1	Amend	Consider drafting policies to emphasize the importance of managing stormwater runoff from 'industrial and trade sites' which are potentially significant sources of contamination. These sites may have significant storage of chemicals and operations that generate contaminants such as suspended solids, oil and grease and heavy metals.	<p>Amend to include new policy:</p> <p><u>SW-P6: Industrial and Trade Sites</u>  <u>Minimize contaminants in stormwater being discharged to the reticulated stormwater network by:</u>  <u>a. requiring treatment of run-off from new development or redevelopment of industrial and trade sites and</u>  <u>b. requiring a Site Specific Stormwater Management Plan for industrial and trade sites with more than 1,000 m2 of impervious areas</u></p>	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Rules Table /General	Son Nguyen	287.2	Amend	Considers the addition of a new rule about stormwater discharge from industrial and trade sites	<p>Add rule:</p> <p><u>SW-R6: Any development of new or redevelopment of industrial and trade sites</u>  <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u>  <u>Where:</u>  <u>1. The maximum impervious area is less than 1000m2</u>  <u>2. Development of new or redevelopment of existing impervious areas meets standard SW-S3</u>  <u>3. Stormwater run-off from the impervious area of the industrial and trade sites must be treated by an</u>  <u>approved stormwater management device designed to remove sediments and contaminants prior to discharge into the stormwater network</u>  <u>4. The approved stormwater management device must be maintained in good working order for the life of the device.</u></p>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Standards Table /General	Son Nguyen	287.3	Amend	Consider including addition stormwater quality standards	<p>Add standard:</p> <p><u>SW-S3: Stormwater Quality</u>  <u>All sites with a connection to a public stormwater network</u></p> <p><u>Purpose : to reduce contaminants entering the stormwater network at source.</u></p> <p><u>1. The diversion and discharge of stormwater runoff must avoid:</u></p> <p><u>a. Producing conspicuous oil or grease films, scums or foams, or floatable or suspended materials</u></p> <p><u>b. Causing any conspicuous change in the colour or visual clarity</u></p> <p><u>c. Emitting objectional odour</u></p> <p><u>d. Rendering of fresh water unsuitable for consumption by farm animals or</u></p> <p><u>e. Causing any significant adverse effects on aquatic life</u></p> <p><u>f. Causing any permanent bed scouring or bank erosion at or beyond the point of discharge</u></p> <p><u>g. Causing flooding of any property</u></p> <p><u>h. Containing hazardous substances</u></p>	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Rules Table	Son Nguyen	287.4	Amend	Considers there to be a typo	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>The road or state highway is designed to accommodate <del>less</del> <del>more</del> than 5,000 vehicles per day;</p>	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Rules Table	Son Nguyen	287.5	Amend	<p>Considers alteration to title of rule to be more specific to development within overland flow paths.</p> <p>Opposes the permitted activity status, instead the activity status should be altered to "Restricted Discretionary"</p>	<p>Amend the title of the rule to read:  <u>Buildings, structures, and earthworks on sites with within overland flow paths.</u></p> <p>Amend the activity status from permitted to restricted discretionary</p>	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Assessment criteria /General	Son Nguyen	287.6	Amend	Considers the need to add additional assessment criteria	<p>Add</p> <p><u>SW-AC3: Overland Flow Paths</u></p> <p><u>For any earthworks, buildings or structures including retaining walls located within an overland flow path:</u></p> <p><u>1. the effects of flooding on the activity proposed, including whether it is a more or less vulnerable activity;</u></p> <p><u>2. the effects on the location of habitable rooms;</u></p> <p><u>3. the design of the building and how it provides for safe access and the potential effects of flood hazards on chosen access routes; and</u></p> <p><u>4. the effects on people during a flood event and the ability to avoid, remedy or mitigate these.</u></p> <p><u>5. the obstruction of flows; and</u></p> <p><u>6. any change to location and capacity; and</u></p> <p><u>7. any changes in depth and velocity of flow; and</u></p> <p><u>8. any change to overland flow on other properties.</u></p> <p><u>9. the provision of alternative overland flow paths;</u></p> <p><u>10. the extent of any associated earthworks and</u></p> <p><u>11. the extent to which methods for long term maintenance of areas affected by flooding, such as easements, are provided</u></p>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Rules Table	Son Nguyen	287.7	Amend	Consider providing an exemption for hydraulic mitigation for small increase in impervious area that complies with the maximum impervious area standards.	Amend rule to include permitted standard:  <b>SW-R5A</b> <b>Activity Status:</b> Permitted  <b>Where:</b> 1. The maximum impervious area standard for the relevant zone or precinct is met, and 2. <u>Development of new or redevelopment of existing impervious areas are less than 50m2</u> 3. Development of new or redevelopment of existing impervious areas meets standard SW-S1	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Standards Table	Son Nguyen	287.8	Amend	Consider amending standard to only apply to new or redevelopment of existing impervious areas that are more than 50m2	Amend standard as follows:  <u>For development of new or redevelopment of existing impervious areas that are more than 50m2</u>	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Objectives /SW-O3: Receiving environment	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.5	Amend	Supports the recognition in the plan of the adverse effects of stormwater discharges on the receiving environment, and in particular Te Whanga (the Ahuriri estuary), together with the recognition that improving stormwater quality, including to meet the requirements of the NPS-FM 2020 and Te Mana o te Wai, "... can be most easily required as part of the development process".  Supports SW-O3 but submits that stronger policies need to be included to achieve this objective, together with rules and standards to put these policies into effect.	Seeks a policy for stormwater treatment, utilising the concept of Green Infrastructure. Considers the criteria for permitted activities rely heavily on "approved stormwater management devices", and seeks more detail to be provided in the plan to ensure that the criteria for approving such devices are consistent with SW-O3. Seeks that the activity status for SW-R1 to SW-R5 should be restricted discretionary where these activities are likely to result in increased stormwater discharges, and the matters of discretion should include low-impact design techniques and green infrastructure. Seeks that the Rules Table in the Stormwater chapter should state that it is subject to any rules in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter that place greater or additional restrictions on activities with adverse effects on receiving environments.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /General /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.35	Amend	Considers the overlap between these chapters makes it very confusing to understand which infrastructure activities are addressed and in which chapter(s) they are addressed. The overlap between provisions in these chapters also makes it unclear how effects are managed and to understand implications for how the ECO provisions may or may not apply to these activities.	Seeks clarification of what activities are addressed in which chapters.  Include provisions for infrastructure that is not a "network utility", "renewable energy generation", "Stormwater" or "transport".  Rename the section heading or change section names to Energy, Infrastructure and Transport.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Objectives /SW-O3: Receiving environment	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.53	Amend	Considers that the Objective needs to support the protection of the coastal environment from the adverse effects of stormwater run-off, in accordance with the NZCPS. Further, the plan should reflect an intention to consider alternative discharge points. Discharging stormwater into one of the most ecologically important areas in the district is questionable.	Seeks to add to SW-O3 as follows: <u>d. Ensure that all stormwater discharges avoid adverse effects on areas of significant biodiversity in the coastal environment, and avoids significant adverse effects on other areas of biodiversity in the coastal environment.</u> Seeks to add a new objective, or incorporate into O3 the following or similar provision, and policy to support that objective as follows: <u>Investigate alternative discharge points that would reduce adverse effects on the coastal environment, in particular Te Whanga.</u>	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Policies /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.54	Amend	Supports the concept of green infrastructure but notes that this concept has not been utilised consistently throughout the plan.	Seeks to include a new policy for stormwater treatment, utilising the concept of green infrastructure, and requiring this to be used in all appropriate situations.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Policies /SW-P1: Onsite detention in existing urban areas with a connection to a public stormwater network	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.55	Support	Support.	Retain.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Policies /SW-P2: Stormwater management in greenfield growth areas	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.56	Support	Support	Retain.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Policies /SW-P3: Overland flow paths	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.57	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Policies /SW-P4: Low impact design	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.58	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /Policies /SW-P5: Roofs, car parks, and roads	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.59	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Rules Table /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.60	Amend	Considers that the criteria for permitted activities rely heavily on "approved stormwater management devices".	Seeks to provide a definition of "approved stormwater management devices", to ensure that the criteria for approving such devices are consistent with SW-O3	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /General /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.61	Oppose	Opposes the whole chapter, including Introduction, Objectives, Policies and Rules. Arising from late notification of ECO-chapter	Seeks to add: <u>"The Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter includes provisions which relate to stormwater. Where there is a conflict between the Stormwater chapter and the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter, the provisions that place greater or additional restrictions on activities with adverse effects on the natural environment will apply".</u>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SW - Stormwater /General /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.62	Amend	Considers that the Coastal Environment chapter should also include provisions relating to stormwater, for example to avoid adverse effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats, biodiversity and threatened or at-risk species.	Seeks to add: <u>"The Coastal Environment chapter includes provisions which relate to stormwater. Where there is a conflict between the Stormwater chapter and the Coastal Environment chapter, the provisions that place greater or additional restrictions on activities with adverse effects on the natural environment will apply"</u> . Seeks to ensure that the CE chapter makes clear that its provisions apply to all activities effecting the CE.	Open Submission
SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Rules Table /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.63	Oppose	Considers that the class of permitted activities in the Stormwater chapter is too wide. Further, the PA standards do not appear to require that there is no increase in SW discharge. This permissive approach is contrary to the SW Issues, Objectives and Policies.	Seeks to amend the rules for Stormwater as follows:  Alter activity status for SW-R1 to SW-R5 to restricted discretionary where these activities are likely to result in increased stormwater discharges, with matters of discretion to include low-impact design techniques, green infrastructure, and improved outcomes for indigenous biodiversity.	Open Submission



# TPT - Transport

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-05: Environmental and amenity valuesThe integrated transport network, including parking, loading and access, does not detract from environmental or amenity values.  Relates to TPT-I4 and TPT-I5	Glen McLeod Anne McLeod	74.3	Oppose	Taradale has a significant number of vulnerable elderly, young children, with play centres and schools off Peddie St. Adding further housing will turn Peddie into a major through-way with non-stop traffic creating safety issues which should be a priority.  Infrastructure is already at peak with traffic on Lee St, Meeanee Rd, and Guppy at capacity during peak travel times. There is no capacity for additional traffic.	no relief sought.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /Manage the design and location of subdivision, use, and development of land so as to minimise traffic patterns that will interfere with the safe and efficient operation of the integrated transport network	Peter Grant	78.11	Amend	Consideration needs to be given explicitly to separating mobility scooters from the general terminology of 'micro mobility'. Our city's population is ageing, and approximately half of our population over 65 live with a disability. This means more and more people will be using out pathways and/or roadways on mobility scooters. Shared pathways may not be the answer with multi-modal micro-mobility options. Suitable, safe pathways will be required.	Amend the policy to include specific mention of mobility scooters in planning effective and safe integration with the transport network.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /Manage the design and location of subdivision, use, and development of land to optimise connectivity	Peter Grant	78.12	Amend	Supports enabling connectivity to multiple escape routes is especially important for older residents who may have less mobility, in the event of an emergency evacuation. Development of subdivisions and land needs to build in evacuation routes where dead-end cul-de-sacs and associated pedestrian/cycle routes /alleyways are not the only option available.	Development of subdivisions and land needs to build in evacuation routes where dead-end cul-de-sacs and associated pedestrian/cycle routes /alleyways are not the only option available to residents, especially those with limited mobility, for evacuation.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /Manage the design of parking areas and the number, location, and type of loading spaces, including bicycle parking and associated end-of-trip facilities	Peter Grant	78.13	Amend	Considers requirement of explicit provision for mobility car parking and efficient placement to meet demand. States there is likely to be an estimated increase in mobility parking permits between 2021 and 2033 which will require an associated increase in the provision of mobility car parking in the city.  Quality living environments in residential zones requires having access to adequate, accessible mobility parking close to or as part of residential developments. (Refer to original submission for figures)	Include specific mention of mobility car parking in the management of the design of parking areas and associated number and location considerations.  Include specific considerations for access to mobility car parks in all residential zones.  (Refer to original submission for linked report.)	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	Peter Grant	78.14	Amend	The proposed standard for bike parking lack mention of e-bike facilities and covered bike parking. States that the standard does not reflect the intention to encourage cycling as transport without these provisions to support health and reduce emissions.	Provide for inclusion of minimum requirements for secure e-bike charging stations, and secure covered bicycle parking at outdoor sites.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-05: Environmental and amenity valuesThe integrated transport network, including parking, loading and access, does not detract from environmental or amenity values.  Relates to TPT-I4 and TPT-I5	Karen Shields	86.2	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of Kennedy Road and Onekawa as a Medium Density Residential Zone and lack of minimum parking requirement due to the impact on parking and traffic congestion. Also considers the negative impact on the character of the suburb, sunlight, and privacy.	No specific relief stated. Seeks to amend the plan to include minimum onsite parking [Inferred Relief]	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	Odette Charlotte Potgieter Henry George Potgieter	90.3	Oppose	Considers the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, No. 40a Peddie Street property value and result in commercial building typologies.  Transport ("TPT") Standards such as TPT-S7: Vehicle trip generation - traffic movements are too high with intensification and together with a lack of carparking and 1.5m front yard setbacks will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increased noise, street parking, vehicle movements, congestion, infrastructure deficits and loss of road reserve and property greenspace.	Seeks consultation with residents and that Peddie Street and Taradale are exempt from intensification in the MRZ and HRZ as notified. (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission

# TPT - Transport

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TPT - Transport /Issues /TPT-I4: Traffic generation may detract from environmental and amenity values	Rosemary Anne Kirby Gregory John Kirby	91.5	Oppose	<p>Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Peddie Street and Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, devaluing of Peddie Street property values and result in commercial building typologies.</p> <p>Transport ("TPT") Issues such as TPT-I4: Traffic generation may detract from environmental and amenity values are contrary to the planned intensification that will result in an increase in adverse effects on environmental and amenity values with increased demand upon finite street parking, vehicle movements (congestion) and resultant noise for residents.</p>	<p>Seeks consultation with residents and that Peddie Street and Taradale is deleted from the intensification provisions of MRZ and HRZ as notified. (Inferred decision requested)</p>	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Issues /TPT-I4: Traffic generation may detract from environmental and amenity values	Ross Dobbie Eileen Dobbie	92.4	Oppose	<p>Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Peddie Street, Taradale and Greenmeadows will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, devaluing of Peddie Street property values and result in commercial building typologies.</p> <p>Transport ("TPT") Issues such as TPT-I4: Traffic generation may detract from environmental and amenity values are contrary to the planned intensification that will result in an increase in adverse effects on environmental and amenity values with increased demand upon finite street parking, vehicle movements (congestion) and resultant noise for residents.</p>	<p>Seeks Council consultation with residents and that Peddie Street, Taradale and Greenmeadows are exempt from intensification in the MRZ and HRZ as notified.(Inferred decision requested)</p>	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Issues /TPT-I4: Traffic generation may detract from environmental and amenity values	Ross Dobbie Eileen Dobbie	93.4	Oppose	<p>Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Peddie Street, Taradale and Greenmeadows will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, devaluing of Peddie Street property values and result in commercial building typologies.</p> <p>Transport ("TPT") Issues such as TPT-I4: Traffic generation may detract from environmental and amenity values are contrary to the planned intensification that will result in an increase in adverse effects on environmental and amenity values with increased demand upon finite street parking, vehicle movements (congestion) and resultant noise for residents.</p>		Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Issues /TPT-I4: Traffic generation may detract from environmental and amenity values	Cameron David Marett	98.6	Oppose	<p>Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Peddie Street and Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, devaluing of Peddie Street property values and result in commercial building typologies.</p> <p>Transport ("TPT") Issues such as TPT-I4: Traffic generation may detract from environmental and amenity values are contrary to the planned intensification that will result in an increase in adverse effects on environmental and amenity values with increased demand upon finite street parking, vehicle movements (congestion) and resultant noise for residents.</p>	<p>Seeks that Peddie Street and Taradale are deleted from MRZ and HRZ intensification. (Inferred decision requested)</p>	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Issues /TPT-I4: Traffic generation may detract from environmental and amenity values	Cameron David Marett	98.10	Oppose	<p>Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Peddie Street and Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, devaluing of Peddie Street property values and result in commercial building typologies.</p> <p>Transport ("TPT") Issues such as TPT-I4: Traffic generation may detract from environmental and amenity values are contrary to the planned intensification that with no minimum carparking requirements will result in an increase in adverse effects on environmental and amenity values with increased demand upon finite street parking, vehicle movements (congestion) and resultant noise for residents.</p>	<p>Seeks Peddie Street and Taradale are exempt from MRZ and HRZ intensification. (Inferred decision requested)</p>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P2: Trip generation	Lynette Harris	106.4	Amend	<p>Submitter objects to the proposed changes in the PDP. Submitter was born in Napier and has lived on Peddie Street for many years, is a pensioner who has made alterations to their home and enjoys living in the quiet peaceful and safe area.</p> <p>Objects to, 19.Sm high apartment blocks being built in Taradale and Greenmeadows, 12m high apartment blocks being built in Taradale and Greenmeadows, Commerclal buildings being built in Taradale and Greenmeadows, No allowance for off street parking, Reduced privacy and sunlight, Increased vehicle movement, Increased noise to 70db all night; and The loss of neighbourhood character.</p> <p>Submitter is stressed about their future and believes it is unnecessary as vacant land exists in Napier.</p>	Relief Sought is not included. However inferred relief sought is that the submitter would like Peddie Street and the surrounding area to be zoned as general residential.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	Lilian Sandra Winnie	107.4	Oppose	Opposes the lack of provisions for off street parking as the additional residential units will result in congestion of neighbouring roads, main arterials and on/off ramps to the highways.	No specific relief sought. Seeks amendment to include minimum parking requirements on residential sites [inferred].	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O5: Environmental and amenity values	Lilian Sandra Winnie	107.7	Oppose	Opposes the lack of no minimum car parking requirements for residential units.	No specific relief sought. Seeks amendment to include minimum standards for onsite parking. [Inferred]	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P2: Trip generation	Cameron David Marett	111.4	Oppose	Opposes this policy based on the lack of car parking minimum requirements elsewhere in the chapter. Concerned about trip generation creating congestion where no parking is required.	Amend this policy to address minimum car parking requirements. [inferred]	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O1: Safe and efficient integrated transportation network	Cameron David Marett	111.8	Oppose	Opposes objective for the lack of provision of onsite vehicle parking	Amend objective to provide for onsite car parking.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	Cameron David Marett	111.9	Oppose	Opposes the lack of no minimum car parking requirements for residential units.	No specific relief sought. Seeks to amend the parking standards to include a minimum requirement [inferred].	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P2: Trip generation	Shirley Rosina Carrington	121.3	Oppose	<p>Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Peddie Street and Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, devaluing of Peddie Street property values and result in commercial building typologies. Transport ("TPT") Policies such as TPT-P2: Trip generation so as to minimise traffic patterns that will interfere with the safe and efficient operation of the integrated transport network is contrary to the planned intensification given there are already carparking issues, increased traffic and noise from businesses and without carparking prescribed ratios there will be increased vehicle movements and congestion.</p> <p>This will result in an increase in adverse effects on environmental and amenity values with increased demand upon finite street parking, vehicle movements (congestion) and resultant noise for residents.</p>	TPT-P2: Trip generation is inconsistent with the HRZ and MRZ intensification provisions / outcomes and seeks that Peddie Street and Taradale are exempt from intensification as notified. (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing	Edward Robert Woolman	122.4		Considers the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) and MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Elbourne Street and around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, trees, sunlight, privacy, greenspace, birdlife and sense of community. Transport Objective TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing is inconsistent with the social mental and physical impacts upon residents (many of whom are pensioners) arising from an unreasonable standard of amenity due to the proposed intensification with increased noise arising from increased density, street parking pressures, congestion and people movements.	Delete MRZ and HRZ provisions from Elbourne Street and around Taradale as notified. (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing	Janet Anne Neill Abby Olivia Neill	127.4	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including King Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers the wellbeing of residents will be impacted by increased noise from traffic, a loss of parking and traffic congestion.	Relief Sought is not included, however it is inferred that the submitter seeks to have the area of Taradale around King Street reverted back to a General Residential Zone (not MRZ or HRZ).	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing	Sandra Esther Wilson	129.3	Amend	Amend High Density Residential (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential (MRZ) for Taradale, particularly Elbourne Street. Submitter is opposed due to social impacts, on both health and well-being of residents. Is concerned about impacts on noise, traffic, loss of green spaces, birdlife, character, sunlight, privacy, community, parking, anti-social behaviour, wind issues and the value of properties. Particular focus on HRZ and MRZ impacting increased people and car movements, loss of street parking, and traffic congestion.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing	Kim Hunter	130.6	Oppose	Considers the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) at 9A Peddie Street, Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, outlook, anticipatory decreased house values and a lack of personal safety. Transport Objective TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing is inconsistent with MRZ and HRZ intensification for Peddie Street and Taradale that will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increases in already exacerbated street parking and vehicle movements. The submission process should also be extended and simplified.	Delete HRZ and MRZ in their entirety for existing neighbourhoods and reconsider greenfield development locations with appropriate infrastructure.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing	Andrea Furness	132.3	Oppose	Considers the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) and MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Elbourne Street, Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, trees, sunlight, privacy, greenspace, birdlife and sense of community. Transport Objective TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing is inconsistent with the social mental and physical impacts upon residents (many of whom are pensioners) arising from an unreasonable standard of amenity due to the proposed intensification with increased noise arising from increased density, street parking pressures, congestion and people movements around work and school.	Delete MRZ and HRZ provisions from Elbourne Street, Taradale. (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing	Deborah and Dennis Dinneen	133.4	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) at 79 McDonald Street, Napier South will result in a loss of neighbourhood character. Transport Objective TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing is inconsistent with MRZ intensification for McDonald Street and Napier South and instead will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increases in already exacerbated street parking (especially given the proximity to McLean Park and events with resultant rubbish) and increased vehicle movements including around school drop-off and pick-up times.	Delete MRZ incompatible provisions (including TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing) from McDonald Street, Napier South.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing	Robina Anne Tipiwai	141.3	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers the wellbeing of residents will be impacted by increased noise from traffic, a loss of parking and traffic congestion.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Rules Table	Pip Beachen	142.51	Amend	Seeks clarification around this rule and which roads it applies to as the new Roading Hierarchy contained within Appendix 18 have re-labelled road classifications.	Amend notified rule or roading hierarchy in order to obtain consistency throughout the Plan and avoid confusion.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	Pip Beachen	142.52	Amend	Seeks clarification around this standard and which classification of roads it applies to as the new Roading Hierarchy contained within Appendix 18 have re-labelled road classifications.	Amend notified standard or roading hierarchy in order to obtain consistency throughout the Plan and avoid confusion.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	Pip Beachen	142.53	Amend	Seeks clarification around this standard and which classification of roads it applies to as the new Roading Hierarchy contained within Appendix 18 have re-labelled road classifications.	Amend notified standard or roading hierarchy in order to obtain consistency throughout the Plan and avoid confusion.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing	Shana Jessie Marie Cochrane	144.3	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including King Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers the wellbeing of residents will be impacted by increased noise from traffic, a loss of parking and traffic congestion.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission

# TPT - Transport

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing	William Nunes	145.3	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including King Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers the wellbeing of residents will be impacted by increased noise from traffic, a loss of parking and traffic congestion.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing	Ethel Kearns	146.3	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers the wellbeing of residents will be impacted by increased noise from traffic, a loss of parking and traffic congestion.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /Manage land uses and development to maintain the safe and efficient delivery of freight as a priority on access routes to industrial zones, Hawke's Bay Airport, Napier Port, and the wider region.	Sera Chambers	150.107	Amend	considers that the wording should be changed to ensure that adjoining landowners are notified and able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment e.g. Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd. In particular Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd should have to provide mitigation requirements to existing residents who are impacted by increased noise from the airport and helicopter/aircraft so that they have the same rights as those impacted by Port noise.	seeks amendment as follows:  <u>manage land use and development to maintain the safe and efficient delivery of freight as a priority on access routes to industrial zones, Hawke's Bay Airport, Napier Port, and the wider region while maintaining adjoining landowners enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.</u>	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /Manage the effects of new transport corridors on residential properties and the receiving environment by incorporating measures such as buffers or noise barriers and low-impact stormwater design at the planning stage.	Sera Chambers	150.108	Amend	considers that the wording should be amended to ensure that the adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment e.g. transport network - NCC/NZTA.	seeks amendment as follows:  <u>manage the effects of new transport corridors on residential properties and the receiving environment by incorporating measures such as buffers or noise barriers and low-impact stormwater design at the planning stage while maintaining adjoining landowners enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principles.</u>	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing	John Gillon	161.3	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers the wellbeing of residents will be impacted by increased noise from traffic, a loss of parking and traffic congestion.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing	Dorothy Brunei Kelsey	162.3	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers the wellbeing of residents will be impacted by increased noise from traffic, a loss of parking and traffic congestion.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing	Allan Thompson	163.3	Amend	Amend Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for Elbourne Street. Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) on the opposite side of Elbourne Street. Has concerns about the zones impact on traffic, noise, their right to consultation, property damage, privacy, sunlight and character of the area.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing	Monique Charlotte Maria Van Groenewoud Raymond Mears	167.3	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including King Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers the wellbeing of residents will be impacted by increased noise from traffic, a loss of parking and traffic congestion.	Relief Sought is not included, however it is inferred that the submitter seeks that the zoning for the Taradale area around Elbourne Street to revert to General Residential Zone (not HRZ or MRZ).	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O1: Safe and efficient integrated transportation network	Sheena McGuire	168.49	Support	Supports the objective for a safe, efficient and integrated transport network. The rail network is important for the movement of freight within Napier City and submitter supports recognition and protection of the ability to move freight via rail.	Retain as proposed	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O2: Economic wellbeing	Sheena McGuire	168.50	Support	Supports the intention to provide safe and efficient freight access for economic wellbeing.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing	Sheena McGuire	168.51	Support	Supports a safe transport network, particularly where road, cycle and pedestrian traffic interacts with the rail network at level crossings.	Retain as proposed	Open Submission

# TPT - Transport

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O6: Road/rail crossings	Sheena McGuire	168.52	Amend	Supports safety at level crossings. Amendment to this objective will help clarify that appropriate controls for safety at level crossings apply to road users, cyclists and pedestrians, as well as neighbouring land uses and development.	Amend as follows:TPT-O6: Road/rail crossingsRoad/rail crossings operate safely with road users, cyclists, pedestrians, neighbouring land use and development.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P1: Roads and connections	Sheena McGuire	168.53	Support	Supports identification and maintenance of transport connections, including recognising their primary function, supporting growth and contributing to health and safety of the community.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P2: Trip generation	Sheena McGuire	168.54	Support	Supports managing design and location of subdivision, use and development to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the integrated transport network. Notes previous submission point which seeks a definition of Land Transport Network, to include the rail network, for clarity.	Retain as proposed	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P3: Freight access routesManage land uses and development to maintain the safe and efficient delivery of freight as a priority on access routes to industrial zones, Hawke's Bay Airport, Napier Port, and the wider region.  Relates to TPT-O2	Sheena McGuire	168.55	Support	Considers the rail network to be a freight access route as the rail network carries freight to and from the Napier Port within Napier City. Supports maintaining the safe and efficient delivery of freight as a priority on these access routes as provided for in this policy.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P6: Access and egress	Sheena McGuire	168.56	Support	Supports the management of the location and design of access to support safety and visibility at level crossings and minimising queuing at level crossings.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P8: Rail level crossings	Sheena McGuire	168.57	Amend	Supports policy to manage land use and development in the vicinity of level crossings. KiwiRail seeks amendments to refine the wording and ensure safety at level crossings is maintained.	Amend as follows:  Manage land use and development to minimise the risk of collisions at level crossings, including by:  a. controlling new or increased use of vehicle access to sites adjacent to all road/rail level crossings to improve safety for road users on the approach to level crossings; b. <del>discouraging avoiding new at-grade road and pedestrian-rail level crossings to ensure the safe, effective, and efficient operation of the rail network, and</del> c. providing controlled safe crossing points for pedestrian and cyclists as part of upgrades to rail level crossings.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Rules Table	Sheena McGuire	168.58	Support	Supports this rule and the requirement of vehicle crossings to comply with all relevant transport standards, including a minimum setback for vehicle crossings from the rail corridor.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Rules Table /General	Sheena McGuire	168.59	Amend	Seeks the inclusion of a new rule relating to sight lines at railway level crossings. Notes that level crossings within Napier City are controlled by a combination of Stop / Give Way signs, and flashing lights / alarms / barrier arms and that different level crossing controls require different sight lines to ensure safety at crossings. Also seeks inclusion of a new standard with diagrams to assist with implementation of the rule. To protect sight lines at level crossings and address TPT-I6 in the Proposed Plan, the new rule and standard are proposed. Compliance with the standard would provide for development as a Permitted Activity, with non-compliance requiring a Restricted Discretionary Activity consent, with discretion restricted to the aspects provided in the new standard. Submitter produced the diagrams shown on the right, for inclusion in district plans throughout New Zealand. Refer to original submission for attached diagrams.	Amend as follows:  <b><u>New rule TPT-R6: Sight lines at railway level crossings All zones</u></b>  <b>Activity status:</b> Permitted  <b>Where:</b> <u>Compliance is achieved with TPT-S8.</u>  <b>Activity status where compliance is not achieved:</b> Restricted Discretionary  <b>Matters of discretion are:</b> 1. <u>The potential for adverse effects on the safety and efficiency of the rail network.</u> 2. <u>Applications under this rule must provide, in addition to the standard information requirements, evidence of engagement with KiwiRail.</u>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table /General	Sheena McGuire	168.60	Amend	<p>Seeks the inclusion of a new rule relating to sight lines at railway level crossings. Notes that level crossings within Napier City are controlled by a combination of Stop / Give Way signs, and flashing lights / alarms / barrier arms and different level crossing controls require different sight lines to ensure safety at crossings. Also seeks inclusion of a new standard with diagrams to assist with implementation of the rule.</p> <p>To protect sight lines at level crossings and address TPT-16 in the Proposed Plan, the new rule and standard are proposed. Compliance with the standard would provide for development as a Permitted Activity, with non-compliance requiring a Restricted Discretionary Activity consent, with discretion restricted to the aspects provided in the new standard. Submitter produced the diagrams shown on the right, for inclusion in district plans throughout New Zealand. Refer to original submission for attached diagrams.</p>	<p><b><u>New standard TPT-S8: Sight triangles at railway level crossings</u></b>  <b><u>Restart sight triangles at level crossings</u></b></p> <p><u>On sites adjacent to all rail level crossings, no building, structure, planting or visual obstruction shall be located within the shaded areas shown in Figure 1. These are defined by a sight triangle taken 5 metres from the outside rail and distance A along the railway track. Distance A depends on the type of control (Table 1).</u></p> <p>(see submission)</p> <p><u>Figure 1: Restart Sight Triangles for all Level Crossings.</u></p> <p><u>Table 1: Required Restart Sight Distances for Figure 1</u></p> <p>Required approach visibility along tracks A (m)                      Signs only - 677m                      Alarms only - 677m                      Alarms and barriers - 60m</p> <p><u>Advice Note:</u></p> <p><u>The restart sight line triangles ensure that a road vehicle driver stopped at a level crossing can see far enough along the railway to be able to start off, cross and clear the level crossing safely before the arrival of any previously unseen train.</u></p>	Open Submission
[List]	Sheena McGuire	168.61	Amend	Supports this standard which requires vehicle access to be a minimum of 30m from any railway level crossing and specifies that access must not cross a railway line. Seeks an advice note to be included in the rule for KiwiRail Holdings Limited be contacted for advice where the proposed access crosses a railway line (private or public crossing) or a railway level crossing.	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p><u>Advice Note: Advice should be sought from KiwiRail Holdings Limited where the vehicle access crosses a railway line (private or public crossing) or a railway level crossing.</u></p>	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing	Edward Te Paki	175.2	Oppose	Opposes Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ), due to a <u>busier road</u> , character, social impacts and noise.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /General /General	Mark Leggett	180.5	Oppose	<p>Opposes the entire Transport chapter of the PDP. Considers that Transport provisions should not apply to GB's site and other Port sites lacking direct legal road access including (Lot 1 DP 13666). Breakwater Road is the nearest legal road identified in the PDP's Roading Hierarchy. The vehicle routes about the site are part of the larger parcel of land relating to the Port as a whole (Legal Desc Part Lot 1 DP 20975). Considers that specific TPT Standards TPT-S3, TPT-S4, TPT-S5, TPT-S6, and TPT-S7 do not apply due to their reference to "roads" and "streets."</p> <p>Also considers that that neither TPT-R2 (New or modified vehicle access and crossings onto a state highway or arterial road) nor the remainder of the activity rules (that all require compliance with the above standards) apply. Seeks a review of Transport chapter's application to PORTZ Zone sites and consequential amendments, proposing an exemption for Port sites lacking legal road access</p>	<p>Amend the TPT Chapter to include the following statement:</p> <p><u>'The following provisions do not apply to sites located in the PORTZ – Port Zone that do not have direct access to a legal road: [list the resulting provisions]'</u></p>	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing	Michael Tony Carson Narelle Vicky Carson	188.3	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) particularly in the Taradale area including Peddie Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers HRZ and MRZ will create a loss of nature, character, sunlight, privacy and community which will impact the wellbeing of residents.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing	Michael Tony Carson Narelle Vicky Carson	188.3	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) particularly in the Taradale area including Peddie Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers HRZ and MRZ will create a loss of nature, character, sunlight, privacy and community which will impact the wellbeing of residents.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission

# TPT - Transport

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	Angela McFlynn	189.57	Amend	Considers that Visitor accommodation can often consist of B&B style accommodation within a dwelling, or short term rentals of standalone private dwellings (e.g., via AirBnB and bookabatch type booking services). In these situations it is not necessary to provide a dedicated loading space (TPT-S3: Loading spaces). The Standard should be amended to reflect the requirement for a loading space for larger scale visitor accommodation such as motels and camping grounds where delivery vehicles are likely to visit the property in association with the day to day running of the business.	Amend (TPT-S3: Loading spaces) to only require provision of a loading space for Visitor accommodation activities providing accommodation for 10 or more people (excluding permanent residents).	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	Angela McFlynn	189.58	Amend	Considers that Manoeuvring should only be required to be provided (TPT-S6: Manoeuvring) within a property if on-site parking is provided.	Amend TPT-S6: Manoeuvring Standard as follows:  TPT-S6: Manoeuvring  1. Activities that provide on-site parking must provide onsite manoeuvring areas so that no reverse manoeuvre by vehicles on to or off the road is necessary, for all activities as set out below: ...	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing	Darryl Furness	200.2	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) especially the zoning of Elbourne street, due to directly effecting the submitter. Is against the proposal as due its impact on the health and wellbeing of residents.Has concerns of increased noise, loss of character, increased traffic, parking, loss of trees and greenspace, sunlight, privacy, loss of community, increased anti-social behaviour, the capability of waste water systems, and liquefaction risk.Also mentions the healthcare system and its ability to cope with an increased population.Particular focus on transport impacts.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Introduction	Grant Russell	202.5	Support	Considers that TPT - Transport Introduction outlining purpose and provisions / outcomes is supported.	Retain TPT - Transport Introduction in its entirety as notified.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Issues /General	Grant Russell	202.6	Support	Supports TPT - Issues.	Retain TPT - Issues in its entirety.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O2: Economic wellbeing	Grant Russell	202.7	Support	Supports TPT - Transport TPT-O2: Economic wellbeing as it ensures efficient freight access to and from the Port.	Retain TPT - Transport TPT-O2: Economic wellbeing.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P3: Freight access routes	Grant Russell	202.8	Support	Considers TPT-P3: Freight access routes should be retained as it ensures a prioritisation of the critical access routes, for the safe and efficient movement of freight to and from the Port, and to the industrial zone (i.e Thames Street, Pandora) and Hawke's Bay Airport.	Retain TPT-P3: Freight access routes in its entirety as notified in the PDP.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	Grant Russell	202.9	Oppose	Opposes TPT - S7: Vehicle trip generation and / or alternative wording to clarify that Napier Port is not required to comply with vehicle movement restrictions.	Amend TPT-S7: Vehicle trip generation to clarify that Napier Port is not required to comply with vehicle movement restrictions. (No specific reason given beyond relief sought - refer original submission)	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	Hus Narsai	205.2	Oppose	Opposes the limit of 400 vehicles per day for all activities except residential activities. This threshold is low for trade supplier activities, and it is recommended that this is increased to recognise the operational demands of these activities.	Bunnings propose that the standard is amended to increase the ITA and trip generation threshold to 700 vehicles (peak) per hour for trade supplier activities.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	Guy Panckhurst	210.7	Amend	Submitter states it is not clear why it is necessary that car parks with more than three spaces are required to be sealed. Low-impact permeable pavement would be preferable form a stormwater perspective.  Landscaping strips need to be 2m wide in indigenous plants, but it is not clear why these are preferable, this should not be mandated. a 2m strip is wider than necessary.	Seeks to remove requirement for sealing of 4 or more carparks.  Seeks to reduce the planting width to 1m.  Seeks to remove restrictions on types of plants.	Open Submission



Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P1: Roads and connections	warren pearce	211.1	Oppose	Opposes the removal of minimum car parking requirements is unnecessary on the grounds of inaccuracies about the impact of carbon emission reduction. Opposes the prioritiation of active and public transport as is does not consider the elderly, disabled or children. Considers the negaitve impact on traffic congestion, emergency access and safety. Considers the negative impact of the Loss of private, quiet culdesac streets and gated communities.  Refer to orignal submission for full reasons.	Seeks amendment to transport policy approach to accomodate more cars considering the proposed approach does not allow for personal choice. Refer to orignal submission for full details.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O1: Safe and efficient integrated transportation network	Georgina McPherson	215.63	Support	The Fuel Companies support TPT-O1 as notified and seek that it is retained.	Retain TPT-O1 as notified.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O2: Economic wellbeing	Georgina McPherson	215.64	Support	The Fuel Companies support TPT-O2 as notified and seek that it is retained.	Retain TPT-O2 as notified.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P2: Trip generation	Georgina McPherson	215.65	Support	The term 'high trip generating activities' is not defined. Service stations primarily attract pass-by trips from motorists already traveling on the roading network and are not a destination activity that attracts new vehicle trips. Notwithstanding this, the Fuel Companies' experience is that service stations are typically treated ashigh trip generating activities. The policy directive to only provide for high trip generating activities where they provide for public transport modes is opposed.	Amend TPT-P2 to provide a level of discretion in terms of considering appropriate locations for high trip generating activities in recognition that accessibility by public transport will not be a relevant consideration in all situations, for example, for service stations. This could be achieved by amending TPT-P2 as follows or to the same effect:  TPT-P2: Trip generation  Manage the design and location of subdivision, use, and development of land so as to minimise traffic patterns that will interfere with the safe and efficient operation of the integrated transport network, including through: a. ensuring transport planning supports the anticipated activities in each zone. b. <del>only</del> providing for high trip generating activities where they: i. safely and effectively integrate with the transport network, and ii. provide for pedestrian, cycling, micro- mobility, and <u>where relevant</u> public transport modes.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P3: Freight access routes	Georgina McPherson	215.66	Support	The Fuel Companies support TPT-P3 as notified and seek that it is retained.	Retain TPT-P3 as notified.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P5: Parking and loading	Georgina McPherson	215.67	Support	The Fuel Companies support TPT-P5 as notified and seek that it is retained.	Retain TPT-P5 as notified	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P6: Access and egress	Georgina McPherson	215.68	Support	The Fuel Companies support TPT-P6 as notified and seek that it is retained.	Retain TPT-P6 as notified.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Rules Table	Georgina McPherson	215.69	Support	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this rule	Retain TPT-R2 as notified.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Rules Table	Georgina McPherson	215.70	Amend	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this rule, however, do not support the scope. As it is currently worded, this rule applies to all activities, including lawfully established activities. This rule should be reframed in terms of 'new' activities infringing standards 1, 4 and 6 to avoid triggering consent for existing lawfully established activities.	Amend TPT-R3 as follows:  TPT-R3: <u>New</u> Activities infringing standards TPT-S1 – TPT-S4 and TPT-S6.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Rules Table	Georgina McPherson	215.71	Support	The Fuel Companies are supportive of a restricted discretionary activity status for activities infringing standards as this aligns with the other TPT provisions and is appropriate for the scale of effects that are sought to be managed by TPT-R4.	Retain TPT-R4 as notified.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Rules Table	Georgina McPherson	215.72	Amend	<p>The Fuel Companies note that this Rule requires compliance with TPT- S6, which is in relation to maneuvering. It is presumed that this is a typo, and compliance should be in accordance with TPT-S7.</p> <p>Regardless, the Fuel Companies support the intent of this rule, however, do not support its scope. The rule applies to lawfully established existing activities and should be re-framed to apply to new activities.</p>	<p>Amend TPT-R5 to correctly refer to TPT-S7: Vehicle- trip generation and to ensure the rule applies only to new high trip generating activities or those that result in an increase in existing generation above the vehicle movement thresholds set out in TPT-S7.</p> <p>TPT-R5: Vehicle trip generation TPT-R5A</p> <p>Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>1. <u>For new activities w</u>where: Compliance is achieved with <del>TPT-S6-</del> TPT-S7</p> <p>2. <u>For existing activities w</u>where a change or variation to the existing activity:</p> <p>i. <u>Does not result in an exceedance of the vehicle movement thresholds in TPT-S7; or</u></p> <p>ii. <u>Does not increase the size, scale or scope of any existing exceedance of a vehiclemovement threshold in TPT-S7.</u></p>	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	Georgina McPherson	215.73	Amend	<p>Standard 2 states that there shall be a maximum of one vehicle crossing per site within residential zones. There are a number of existing service stations in Napier with a residential zoning that typically have two separate vehicle crossings to improve safety for vehicles entering and exiting the site and more efficient traffic flows through the site.</p> <p>Standard 2 also states that where a site has more than one frontage, the vehicle entrance must be onto the road that has the lower hierarchy. The Fuel Companies do not consider this requirement to be appropriate or necessary and it should be removed.</p>	<p>Amend TPT-S4 to ensure service as follows:</p> <p>1. All sites must have a legal, safe, and effective vehicular access from an existing, formed legal road, except where no car parking is provided on site.</p> <p>2. There shall be a maximum of one vehicle crossing per site for <u>residential activities</u> within residential zones. Where a site <u>residential activity</u> is bordered by two or more roads, the vehicle access to the property must be from the lower category road. The category of the road will be determined by its classification in the road hierarchy or traffic volumes where classification status is equal. For the purposes of this standard, the roading hierarchy shall be:</p> <p>a. Transit corridors;</p> <p>b. ....</p>	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	Anitha Premraj Sam Goddard	216.2	Oppose	<p>Opposes the limit of 400 vehicles per day for all activities except residential activities. This threshold is low for most retail and commercial activities, and an increase would recognise the operational demands of these activities.</p>	<p>McDonald’s propose that the standard is amended to increase the ITA and trip generation threshold to 100 vehicles per hour for commercial activities including hospitality and drive through restaurant activities.</p>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P2: Trip generation	Shravan Miryala	217.10	Amend	Notes that the term 'high trip generating activities' is not defined. Service stations primarily attract pass-by trips from motorists already traveling on the roading network and are not a destination activity that attracts new vehicle trips. Considers that service stations are typically treated as high trip generating activities and that the principal activity of service stations is the retail sale of motor vehicle fuels. While provision is typically made for safe pedestrian and cyclist access to service stations, accessibility by public transport is not relevant to the appropriate location of service stations. Opposes policy directive to only provide for high trip generating activities where they provide for public transport modes. Considers there will be other 'high trip generating activities' to which this concern is relevant.	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy TPT-P2 to provide a level of discretion in terms of considering appropriate locations for high trip generating activities in recognition that accessibility by public transport will not be a relevant consideration in all situations, for example, for service stations. This could be achieved by amending Policy TPT-P2 as follows or to the same effect:</p> <p><b>TPT-P2: Trip generation</b></p> <p>Manage the design and location of subdivision, use, and development of land so as to minimise traffic patterns that will interfere with the safe and efficient operation of the integrated transport network, including through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. ensuring transport planning supports the anticipated activities in each zone.</li> <li>b. <del>only</del> providing for high trip generating activities where they:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. safely and effectively integrate with the transport network, and</li> <li>ii. provide for pedestrian, cycling, micro-mobility, and, <u>where relevant</u>, public transport modes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Rules Table /TPT-R3: Activities infringing standards TPT-S1 - TPT-S4 and TPT-S6Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary  Matters of discretion are:  The matters of discretion stated for infringing the relevant standard(s).  Note: The activity status for the relevant activity and the associated matters of control/discretion (where applicable) apply in addition to this rule. NA	Shravan Miryala	217.11	Amend	Supports the intent of this rule, however, does not support its scope as the current wording, this rule applies to all activities, including lawfully established activities. Considers that this rule should be reframed in terms of 'new' activities infringing standards 1, 4 and 6 to avoid triggering consent for existing lawfully established activities. Notes that this would apply where a trivial change needs to be made to an existing lawfully established activity that might otherwise trigger this rule.	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule TPT-R3 as follows:</p> <p>TPT-R3: <u>New</u> Activities infringing standards TPT-S1 –TPT-S4 and TPT-S6.</p>	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Rules Table	Shravan Miryala	217.12	Amend	Notes the rule's requirement for compliance with Standard TPT-S6 but suggests it may be a typo, seeking alignment with Standard TPT-S7. Support the rule's intent but opposes its broad scope, which encompasses all activities, including lawfully established ones. Considers it should be reframed the rule to apply specifically to "new" vehicle trip generating activities to prevent unnecessary resource consent for minor changes to existing lawful activities. Considers that where a change is proposed to an existing activity, consent should only be triggered if the change results in an exceedance of the vehicle movement thresholds in Standard TPT-S7 or an increase in the degree of any existing exceedance of the vehicle movement thresholds.	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule TPT-R5 to correctly refer to Standard TPT- S7: Vehicle-trip generation and to ensure the rule applies only to new high traffic generating activities or those that result in an increase in existing generation above the vehicle movement thresholds set out in TPT- S7.</p> <p>TPT-R5: Vehicle trip generation TPT-R5A</p> <p>Activity Status: Permitted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>For new activities w</u>Where: Ecompliance is achieved with <del>TPT-S6- TPT-S7</del></li> <li>2. <u>For existing activities w</u>Where a change or variation to the <u>existing activity:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <u>Does not result in an exceedance of the vehicle movement thresholds in TPT-S7; or</u></li> <li>ii. <u>Does not increase the size, scale or scope of any existing exceedance of a vehicle movement threshold in TPT-S7.</u></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	Shravan Miryala	217.13	Amend	Opposes this Standard. Considers it should only relate to new activities and not existing, nor changes to existing car parking areas, to require landscaping 2m deep in front of existing car parking spaces, if they were being reworked, for instance, would be onerous. Also considers that the performance standard is likely to compete with the permitted activity rule / standard in the NUO Chapter which permits EV Charging equipment (Rule NU-R10 / Standard NU-S1).Notes It is common to have EV charging facilities on the edge of a site and often near or on the road boundary as the power source is usually in the Road and therefore the EV facility needs to tap into that power source, and needs to be close to it for efficiency purposes. Also note this is because car parking spaces often need to be on the perimeters of sites, to allow for manoeuvring space and buildings to be designed in a safe and efficient manner.	Amend TPT-S1: Car parking as follows  Landscaping  6. Where any <u>new</u> vehicle parking area is formed adjacent to any road or public place (except for activities permitted under rule NU-R10 in the NUO Chapter), a landscaped area of indigenous plants 2 m wide adjacent to the road or public place must be provided and maintained, except for driveways.  Note: where zones and/or precincts also contain landscaping standards, the more restrictive standard applies.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	Shravan Miryala	217.14	Amend	Supports the intent of Standard TPT-S2 but notes if the submitter were to upgrade / alter / fix / replace facilities at an existing service station and changes some existing lawfully established car parking spaces around, or reduced the number, it would require consideration of this Standard that will likely require consent (noting the limitations of existing buildings, small sites, limited ability to expand etc). Notes that Most trips to Service Stations are to buy fuel and customers are not anticipated to visit by bikes.	<b>Amend</b> TPT-S2 to ensure these apply to new car parks and new non-residential activities and exclude existing service station sites from meeting these requirements as follows.  TPT-S2: Bike Parking  1. One bike stand must be provided <del>per</del> <u>for every five new</u> car park spaces on site, except for supermarkets where one bike stand must be provided per 20 car park spaces.  .....  4. <u>New</u> Non-residential activities must provide the following end-of-trip facilities (intended for staff use):....  <u>Except where:</u>  <u>a. the site is utilised by a lawfully established existing service station activity.</u>	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	Shravan Miryala	217.15	Amend	Opposes in part Standard TPT-S5 subject to clarification that the rule will not be triggered by the following, inter alia, activities at existing service stations: - Replacement infrastructure; - Upgrading of underground or above ground infrastructure; - Small scale accessory building or operational changes that do not increase the intensity or scale of the activity (e.g.: traffic); - Maintenance or fixing of anything at the site. - Replacement tanks.  Considers that these types of activities should not require compliance with TPT-S5 is because they are required to ensure efficient operation of lawfully established activities.	<b>Clarify</b> that Standard TPT-S5 is not required to be considered for accessory buildings and minor changes to lawful and existing activities.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	Shravan Miryala	217.16	Amend	Supports the standard in part however seeks clarification that the thresholds (and therefore the standard) need only be considered/applicable where new or significantly expanded existing activities are proposed. Seeks to ensure that the standard would not be triggered by the installation of 1 x additional fuel dispenser, existing site upgrades or redevelopment of the same character and intensity. Seeks an exception for existing service stations in residential zones from complying with the maximum number of vehicle movements per day. Considers that this would be unduly constraining for the efficient functioning and operation of the existing Taradale and Tamatea service stations. Requests that this standard is reframed in terms of 'new' activities only.	<b>Amend</b> Standard TPT-S7 as follows:  2. <u>New</u> Activities in residential zones must not exceed the following vehicle movement thresholds:.....  3. <u>New</u> Activities in all other zones must not exceed the following vehicle movement thresholds:....	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing	Maria Roberts	219.3	Amend	Amend TPT-03 to add the word accessible, as when safety is referred to, it's often appropriate to also include the word "accessible", which covers the needs experienced by disabled people.	Amend TPT-03: "The integrated transport network provides safe, <u>accessible</u> , and attractive routes for active transport modes and minimises effects on public health and community wellbeing, including from noise, vibration, and discharges to air."	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O1: Safe and efficient integrated transportation network	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.21	Support	Supports the objective as it promotes an efficient and integrated transport network for the district with a focus on encouraging active modes. Supports the uptake of students using active modes to get to and from school.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.22	Support	Supports the objective as it promotes safe transport routes and encourages active and healthy transport modes for the district.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P1: Roads and connections	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.23	Amend	Supports the objective as it promotes safe and active modes of transport that contribute to health, safety and the wellbeing of the community.  However, requests the following amendments are made, including the removal of 'where practicable' from b) as this provision should promote optimal road networks that encourage safe modes of transport for all active mode users, not just when it is practicable. The policy should encourage continuous improvements to the road network that enables active mode travellers in a way that also protects the vulnerable demographics, such as students, commuting to schools each day.	Amend to:  <b>Roads and connections</b>  Identify and maintain an integrated network of roads and other transport connections that: a. recognise and relate to their primary function(s) and supporting land use; b. <u>are progressively upgraded to where practicable</u> provide for different modes of land transport; c. supports growth, and d. contributes to the health, safety, and wellbeing of the community.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P4: Connectivity	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.24	Amend	The Ministry supports provision TPT-P4. As students and staff utilise and rely on safe routes and road networks; cycleways and walkways; and the safe design of intersections and crossings everyday in their commute to schools.  The Ministry supports the uptake of students choosing active modes of travel to schools as it has health benefits and reduces traffic congestion on the road network at peak pick up and drop off time.  Amend item a) with the removal of 'where practicable'. The intent of the use of the word 'where practicable' is already achieved by saying cul-de-sacs must be minimised. The Ministry generally supports the avoidance of cul-de-sacs altogether to enabled well connected road networks.  The Ministry also supports amendments to part (e) to encourage vulnerable road users, like children, to be at the forefront of Council and developer's minds when designing roading infrastructure. The Ministry would support the inclusion of a new definition to the Proposed Plan, outlining who vulnerable users are.	Seeks to amend as followed:  <b>Connectivity</b>  Manage the design and location of subdivision, use, and development of land to optimise connectivity, including through: a. providing a connected roading network, including minimising the use of cul- de-sacs <del>where practicable</del> ; b. establishing safe cycleways and walkways and enhancing the safety of existing cycle and pedestrian routes; c. implementing CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) principles; d. supporting initiatives to increase use of public transport; e. ensuring that infrastructure associated with active transport and public transport modes is safe, convenient, and accessible to all sectors of the community, <del>including vulnerable users</del> , and  designing intersections to facilitate safe and efficient crossing for all vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Rules Table	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.25	Amend	Schools would often be considered high vehicle generating activities. The ministry's notice of requirement process is often accompanied by an integrated transport assessment.  Therefore, supports the requirement to manage traffic effects of schools on the road network. Requests to Amend TPT-R5A to reference the correct standard.	Amend the Following:  <b>Vehicle trip generation TPT-R5A</b>  Activity Status: Permitted Where:  1. Compliance is achieved with <del>TPT-S6</del> TPT-S7.  TPT R5B  Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are:  1. The relevant matters of discretion for the standard infringed.  Section 88 information requirements for applications:  Applications under this rule must provide an Integrated Transport Assessment by a suitably qualified transport engineer or transport planner. The Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency guidelines 'Research Report 422: Integrated Transport Assessment Guidelines, November 2010' should be used to inform any Integrated Transport Assessment.  A basic ITA should focus on effects on the site's road frontage and the nearby intersections only. A full ITA requires a broader assessment of how the proposed activity fits within the wider	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.26	Support	The Ministry supports provision TPT-S7 as an acceptable trigger for a restricted discretionary activity for high trip generating activities.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Assessment Criteria /TPT-AC1: High trip generating activity (TPT-R2)	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.27	Support	The Ministry considers this assessment criteria to be appropriate and can be addressed in an Integrated Transport Assessment.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.28	Support	The Ministry supports the requirements of provision TPT-S2 to provide bike stands and end of trip cycling facilities (showers) and considers them appropriate.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	Sam Goddard	238.3	Oppose	Opposes the limit of 400 vehicles per day for all activities except residential activities. Considers this threshold is low for most retail and commercial activities, and it is recommended that this is increased to recognise the operational demands of these activities.	Amend to increase the ITA and trip generation threshold to 100 vehicles per hour for retail and commercial activities including supermarket activities.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing	denise fastier	245.4	Oppose	Considers that there is unreasonable traffic noise outside excepted hours in a mixed residential/ commercial zone. Seeks quiet times between 10pm to 6am so residents can sleep.	Seeks quiet times between 10pm to 6am so residents can sleep. No specific relief sought	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O2: Economic wellbeing	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.37	Support	Supports Objective TPT-O2: Economic wellbeing as Ravensdown receives and dispatches various products through the port. Therefore, a safe and efficient transport network that provides for efficient freight movement is important.	Retain Objective TPT-O2 as notified.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P3: Freight access routes	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.38	Support	Supports Policy TPT-P3: Freight access routes for the reasons outlined above in relation to Objective TPT-O2, this policy is also supported.	Retain Policy TPT-P3 as notified.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives	Alan White	249.4	Amend	The following objectives, policies and methods apply to transportation matters.  <b>Objective 61.3</b>  To maintain a safe and efficient transport network that meets the needs of the community and the future growth of Napier without creating significant adverse effects.  This objective relates to Issues 61.2.1; 61.2.2 and 61.2.3.  <b>The objective is agreed but the current system is not safe for those who cycle or walk in Napier. Greater Council spending needs to be dedicated to safety advocacy for all road users, especially cyclists and pedestrians.</b>	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O5: Environmental and amenity values	Alan White	249.5	Amend	<p>Objective 61.4</p> <p>To maintain an integrated transportation network (road, rail, sea, and air) while avoiding, remedying or mitigating any adverse effects on the environment.</p> <p>This objective relates to Issue 61.2.4 and 61.2.5.</p> <p><b>Development and especially vehicle emissions are already creating significant adverse effects. This objective needs to be strengthened and the Council needs to provide leadership and create a change environment in transport choices. The current wording will only produce more of the same.</b></p>	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P1: Roads and connections	Alan White	249.6	Oppose	<p><b>Policies</b></p> <p>To achieve this objective the Council will:</p> <p>61.4.1</p> <p>Identify and recognise routes that efficiently serve the needs of the different transport sectors while minimising the adverse effects on residential areas.</p> <p><b>The development of an integrated transport network needs a contribution from all sector users. For such hierarchy to be accepted, community involvement is required. This has not happened for the cycling sector.</b></p>	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P1: Roads and connections	Alan White	249.7	Oppose	<p><b>Policies</b></p> <p>To achieve this objective the Council will:</p> <p>61.4.1</p> <p>Identify and recognise routes that efficiently serve the needs of the different transport sectors while minimising the adverse effects on residential areas.</p> <p><b>How can the Council identify and recognise routes that efficiently serve the needs of different transport sectors when they only consult with roading transport and emergency services users?</b></p>	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Issues /TPT-I4: Traffic generation may detract from environmental and amenity values	Alan White	249.8	Amend	<p>Considers the Transport Strategy has yet to be shared. States that due to this the final draft review of the district plan related to transportation has had limited public input.</p> <p>In recent years there has been an increasing tendency for commercial trucking firms to park trucks in residential areas so drivers can get away from home. This is inappropriate and the Noise provisions of the District Plan should preclude such actions with regulations promulgated to prevent it happening, especially in the early hours. This also results in reduced visibility in residential streets. Industrial activities should be restricted to industrial areas.</p> <p>Houses previously only owning one vehicle are now being tenanted and up to 5-6 vehicles can be seen parked on grass and driveways on one property. Without viable active transport options, some streets are becoming difficult to use for thoroughfare.</p> <p>On the narrow streets through Pirimai it is getting to a point where the available road space for through traffic is limited by cars parking either side of the street. On street licencing or some incentive to have residents park vehicles on their property is needed if normal on street thoroughfare is not going to be compromised.</p>	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission

# TPT - Transport

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing	Sandra Hagan	252.2	Oppose	Considers transport plans don't include minimum car parking. Whanau need transport so do senior citizens that are less mobile. Roads have already been impacted and public transport is unreliable.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O1: Safe and efficient integrated transportation network	Leanne Roberts	257.25	Support	HortNZ supports the recognition of a safe and efficient transport network that supports growth and the movement of freight.	Seeks to retain TPT-O1	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O2: Economic wellbeing	Leanne Roberts	257.26	Amend	Considers efficient transport routes are critical to the economic wellbeing of the horticulture sector, particularly for products with short shelf life, to minimise costs to consumers, and to facilitate production activities. Efficient access to the port is imperative and must be improved, and airport access is also important.	Seeks to amend TPT-O2 to specifically recognise the role of an integrated transport network in supporting the economic wellbeing of the horticulture sector:  The integrated transport network supports economic wellbeing, particularly of the horticulture sector, particularly by providing safe and efficient freight access to the port and airport, as well as across the local roading network.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P3: Freight access routesManage land uses and development to maintain the safe and efficient delivery of freight as a priority on access routes to industrial zones, Hawke's Bay Airport, Napier Port, and the wider region.  Relates to TPT-O2	Leanne Roberts	257.27	Amend	The policy is supported in terms of safe and efficient delivery of freight but there is no recognition of the importance of freight in the rural areas, where delivery of produce is critical.	Seeks to amend TPT-P3 to specifically identify rural areas as dependent on freight networks.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Rules Table	Leanne Roberts	257.28	Amend	Considers rule TPT-R5A requires compliance with TPT-S6. It would seem that this should be TPT-S7 which has 400 light vehicle movement per day and 50 heavy vehicle movements per day outside of the residential zones. Beyond these number a restricted discretionary consent is required.	Seeks to amend TPT-R5A (1) to refer to TPT-S7.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	Leanne Roberts	257.29	Amend	HortNZ supports the intent but are unsure if it is realistic to have maximum number of vehicle movements in the rural zone. Many unforeseen events, and seasonal activities may means this will be exceeded.	Seeks to amend TPT-S7 to remove maximum vehicle movements in the rural zone.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Introduction	Robin Gwynn	262.1	Oppose	Submitter provides feedback on the nature and usability of the plan, including the need for specified time period and pagination. Notes the negative impact of the current state of road infrastructure in Napier, particularly regarding the increased use of "sleeping policemen" and the replacement of old parking meters. Questions the cost and guidelines for installing "sleeping policemen" and requests clarification on the total expenditure.  Considers the number and nature of "sleeping policemen," to be excessive, counterproductive, and do not contribute to a quality living environment, especially for older residents. Notes the impact of road changes on elderly and disabled residents, emphasizing the need for road infrastructure to accommodate the safety and well-being of all citizens. Considers the negative impact of multiple "sleeping policemen" on public health and community well-being, and that rates should not be spent on infrastructure causing distress to older individuals. Notes concerns about traffic congestion at specific intersections and suggests a review of traffic light timings. Considers that the plan fails to achieve TPT-O3; that our integrated transport network should 'minimise effects on public health and community wellbeing' due to increase use of sleeping policemen in the roading network. Also considers that that plan also fails to achieve TPT-P1 'contributing to the health, safety and well-being of the community' for these reasons. Refer to original submission for full reasons.	Submitter provides a summary of the issues highlighted and considers that there has not been enough consultation and discussion before actions have been taken. Notes the priority of climate change matters, followed by the future of the Cathedral. Notes the roading and traffic issues discussed. Considers that these challenges need thought, prayer, joint action and new approaches. No provision-specific relief sought. Refer to original submission for full details.	Open Submission



Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing	Robin Gwynn	262.4	Oppose	<p>Submitter provides feedback on the nature and usability of the plan, including the need for specified time period and pagination. Notes the negative impact of the current state of road infrastructure in Napier, particularly regarding the increased use of "sleeping policemen" and the replacement of old parking meters. Questions the cost and guidelines for installing "sleeping policemen" and requests clarification on the total expenditure. Considers the number and nature of "sleeping policemen," to be excessive, counterproductive, and do not contribute to a quality living environment, especially for older residents.</p> <p>Notes the impact of road changes on elderly and disabled residents, emphasizing the need for road infrastructure to accommodate the safety and well-being of all citizens. Considers the negative impact of multiple "sleeping policemen" on public health and community well-being, and that rates should not be spent on infrastructure causing distress to older individuals.</p> <p>Notes concerns about traffic congestion at specific intersections and suggests a review of traffic light timings. Considers that the plan fails to achieve TPT-O3; that our integrated transport network should 'minimise effects on public health and community wellbeing' due to increase use of sleeping policemen in the roading network. Also considers that that plan also fails to achieve TPT-P1 'contributing to the health, safety and well-being of the community' for these reasons. Refer to original submission for full reasons.</p>	Submitter provides a summary of the issues highlighted and considers that there has not been enough consultation and discussion before actions have been taken. Notes the priority of climate change matters, followed by the future of the Cathedral. Notes the roading and traffic issues discussed. Considers that these challenges need thought, prayer, joint action and new approaches. No provision-specific relief sought. Refer to original submission for full details.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P1: Roads and connections	Robin Gwynn	262.5	Oppose	<p>Submitter provides feedback on the nature and usability of the plan, including the need for specified time period and pagination. Notes the negative impact of the current state of road infrastructure in Napier, particularly regarding the increased use of "sleeping policemen" and the replacement of old parking meters. Questions the cost and guidelines for installing "sleeping policemen" and requests clarification on the total expenditure. Considers the number and nature of "sleeping policemen," to be excessive, counterproductive, and do not contribute to a quality living environment, especially for older residents.</p> <p>Notes the impact of road changes on elderly and disabled residents, emphasizing the need for road infrastructure to accommodate the safety and well-being of all citizens. Considers the negative impact of multiple "sleeping policemen" on public health and community well-being, and that rates should not be spent on infrastructure causing distress to older individuals.</p> <p>Notes concerns about traffic congestion at specific intersections and suggests a review of traffic light timings. Considers that the plan fails to achieve TPT-O3; that our integrated transport network should 'minimise effects on public health and community wellbeing' due to increase use of sleeping policemen in the roading network. Also considers that that plan also fails to achieve TPT-P1 'contributing to the health, safety and well-being of the community' for these reasons. Refer to original submission for full reasons.</p>	Submitter provides a summary of the issues highlighted and considers that there has not been enough consultation and discussion before actions have been taken. Notes the priority of climate change matters, followed by the future of the Cathedral. Notes the roading and traffic issues discussed. Considers that these challenges need thought, prayer, joint action and new approaches. No provision-specific relief sought. Refer to original submission for full details.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	Phil Stickney	263.3	Oppose	<p>Opposes the blanket restriction of 400 vehicles per day for any activity in TPT-S7 as this is unduly restrictive, particularly in respect of large-scale retail (LFR) activities. The Plan directs the scale of the buildings associated with such activities to be over 1000sqm however then places restrictions through other District wide chapters which do not align with the nature of the activity that is Permitted by the Plan.</p>	Amend the rates to reflect the generation effects of such activities or introduce a scale of traffic or delete this standard.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TPT - Transport /Introduction	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.41	Amend	Supports the introduction to the Transport chapter as proposed. Seeks for Council to more explicitly recognise the need to manage reverse sensitivity. The Proposed Plan also overlooks the role of the transport industry in reducing domestic greenhouse gas emissions.	Amend as follows:  Introduction  The purpose of the Transportation chapter is to manage development to achieve an integrated approach to land use and transportation planning. A key outcome the District Plan seeks to achieve is “Great Urban Areas”. The quality of urban areas, including the supporting transportation network, impacts directly on our quality of life. <u>Well integrated transport and land use development</u> , the layout and design of the transportation network can contribute to economic wellbeing, community cohesion, health, and safety. To achieve these key outcomes, and to meet relevant key principles and strategic objectives for the District Plan, the transportation provisions provide for the following:  a. Managing activities and their access and egress requirements to support a functional, safe and efficient multi-modal transportation network, including road, rail, cycleways, walkways, and public transport routes which contribute to economic wellbeing, and quality living environments, <u>reduced greenhouse gas emissions and effective management of sensitive receiving environments.</u>	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Issues /TPT-I1: Traffic generation from growth may detract from the safe and efficient operation of the integrated transportation network.	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.42	Support	Supports the issue TPT-I1 as it provides for a safe, efficient, and well-connected transport network and recognises high trip generating activities can impact the operation of the transport network. Considers that the effective integration of land use and transport will also assist with reducing greenhouse gas emissions as a positive consequence of reducing motor vehicle trips. The transport industry is anticipated to play a significant role in managing New Zealand’s domestic greenhouse gas emissions and this is a matter that the district plan needs to be mindful of in terms of managing land use development patterns.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Issues /TPT-I2: Reliance on private motor vehicles may detract from public health and community wellbeing	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.43	Support	Supports the issue TPT-I1 as it provides for a safe, efficient, and well-connected transport network and recognises high trip generating activities can impact the operation of the transport network. Considers that the effective integration of land use and transport will also assist with reducing greenhouse gas emissions as a positive consequence of reducing motor vehicle trips. The transport industry is anticipated to play a significant role in managing New Zealand’s domestic greenhouse gas emissions and this is a matter that the district plan needs to be mindful of in terms of managing land use development patterns.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Issues /TPT-I3: A lack of connectivity can increase the vulnerability of Napier’s communities to natural hazards	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.44	Support	Supports the issue TPT-I1 as it provides for a safe, efficient, and well-connected transport network and recognises high trip generating activities can impact the operation of the transport network. Considers that the effective integration of land use and transport will also assist with reducing greenhouse gas emissions as a positive consequence of reducing motor vehicle trips. The transport industry is anticipated to play a significant role in managing New Zealand’s domestic greenhouse gas emissions and this is a matter that the district plan needs to be mindful of in terms of managing land use development patterns.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

# TPT - Transport

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TPT - Transport /Issues /TPT-I4: Traffic generation may detract from environmental and amenity values	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.45	Support	Supports the issue TPT-I1 as it provides for a safe, efficient, and well-connected transport network and recognises high trip generating activities can impact the operation of the transport network. Considers that the effective integration of land use and transport will also assist with reducing greenhouse gas emissions as a positive consequence of reducing motor vehicle trips. The transport industry is anticipated to play a significant role in managing New Zealand's domestic greenhouse gas emissions and this is a matter that the district plan needs to be mindful of in terms of managing land use development patterns.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O1: Safe and efficient integrated transportation network	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.46	Support	Supports this objective as it supports integrated transport options including multi-modal connections.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.47	Amend	Supports in part objective TPT-O3. Seeks for Council to amend this objective as proposed to recognise the role that the transport industry will play in managing greenhouse gas emissions.	Amend as follows:  <b>TPT-O3: Public health and community wellbeing</b>  The integrated transport network provides safe and attractive routes for active transport modes and minimises effects on public health and community wellbeing, including from noise, vibration, and discharges to air <u>including greenhouse emissions</u> .	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O4: Resilience	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.48	Support	Supports in part objective TPT-O4 as it recognises the need to provide a transport network that is resilient to natural hazards and includes the requirement to promote resiliency against the anticipated effects of climate change through mitigation and adaptation.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P1: Roads and connections	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.49	Amend	Supports in part policy TPT-P1 as it recognises the benefits of a well-integrated transport network in providing for growth, however, to ensure the District Plan recognises road function submitter recommends the plan adopts the NZTA One Network Framework (ONF). The ONF promotes a road hierarchy but acknowledges that within this hierarchy, roads and streets are a place that supports adjoining land use activities as destinations. Considers that this approach recognises that different classification of roads support different land use functions and as such, should support different transport modes. Also supports TPT-P1 as it recognises the transport network needs to support growth. Recommends that Council broadens TPT-P1 to clarify that growth should be focussed to ensure consistency with the Napier Spatial Picture. Also seeks for Council to recognise that reducing greenhouse gas emissions will contribute to the long-term well-being of Napier.	Amend as follows:  TPT-P1: Roads and connections  Identify and maintain an integrated network of roads and other transport connections consistent with the <u>One Network Framework</u> which: a. recognise and relate to their primary function(s) and supporting land use b. where practicable provide for different modes of land transport c. supports growth that aligns with the <u>Napier Spatial Picture</u> d. contributes to the health, safety and wellbeing of the community, <u>including through the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions</u> .	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P2: Trip generation	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.50	Support	Support policy TPT-P2 as it manages design and location of land use development to minimise traffic effects and caters for high trip activities in the appropriate locations.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P4: Connectivity	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.51	Support	Supports TPT-P4 as it recognises the connectivity function of the transport network.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P6: Access and egress	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.52	Support	Supports TPT-P6 as it recognises the need to manage accesses on the transport network for a range of matters.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Rules Table	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.53	Amend	Supports rule TPT-R2 as proposed. Considers that this rule enables a broad assessment by NZTA of the effects of land use development on the safe and efficient operation of the state highway network. This rule recognises the need to carefully manage the throughflow and function requirement of the national state highway network, including to ensure the movement of freight both within and across Hawke's Bay. Because road function, traffic volumes and operating speeds are typically higher, careful consideration in the assessment of land use access to promote the safety of network users is required. Also considers that this rule also recognises that sections of the state highway network within Napier City are Limited Access Road, which means access is at the discretion of NZTA.	Amend:  Note: Approval from NZ Transport Agency <del>may</del> <u>will</u> be necessary for <u>increased trip generation and new or amended</u> vehicle access onto a state highway.	Open Submission

# TPT - Transport

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Rules Table	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.54	Amend	Supports the rule around trip generation but considers compliance should be with TPT-S7 rather than S6	Amend: Compliance is achieved with TPT-S76.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.55	Support	Supports Council encouraging the provision of bike parking and end of trip shower and changing facilities as an incentive for shifting travel mode patterns toward active modes.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.56	Support	Supports standard TPT-S4 as it requires site access to be legal, safe, effective and gained from a lower hierarchy road where possible. Also support the standards cross reference to the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.57	Support	Supports standard TPT-S5 (4) as it promotes a safe separation distance between vehicle accessways and intersections with a state highway.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Assessment Criteria /TPT-AC1: High trip generating activity (TPT-R2)	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.58	Support	Supports assessment criteria AC1 as it requires consideration of the safety and efficiency of the transport network with consideration of location and design of accesses.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives	Alec Duncan	288.23	Amend	Supports TPT-O1 to the extent that it requires a safe and efficient integrated transportation network that supports growth, including provision for a range of transport options and needs including public transport, walking, cycling, micro-mobility, private vehicles, and the movement of freight. However, it is vital that the transportation network also provides for the needs of emergency service vehicles.  Fire and Emergency requests that emergency service vehicles are explicitly listed in TPT-O1 in recognition of their important role and function in all communities.	Amend as follows:  TPT-O1: Safe and efficient integrated transportation network  A safe and efficient integrated transportation network that supports growth, including provision for public transport, walking, cycling, micro-mobility, private vehicles, <u>emergency service vehicles</u> , and the movement of freight.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O4: Resilience	Alec Duncan	288.24	Support	For Fire and Emergency to effectively respond in emergency situations such as severe weather and natural hazard events, it is vital that the transport network is resilient to the effects of natural hazards such as flooding and land instability. If the transport network is not resilient to these effects, communities can be cut off and Fire and Emergency's ability to access them can be impeded. As such, Fire and Emergency supports TPT-O4 insofar that it acknowledges that the transport network can contribute to the resilience of communities and to the effects of natural hazards and climate change.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies /TPT-P1: Roads and connections	Alec Duncan	288.25	Support	Fire and Emergency supports TPT-P1 insofar that it seeks to identify and maintain an integrated network of roads and transport connections that supports growth and contributes to the health, safety, and wellbeing of the community. Providing an integrated and connected network will enable Fire and Emergency to carry out its duties in protecting people which contributes to the community's health, safety and wellbeing.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Policies	Alec Duncan	288.26	Amend	Supports TPT-P6 insofar that it seeks to manage the number, location, and design of access and egress points.  It is important that safe and efficient emergency service access is also provided, whether that be by vehicle or by foot to ensure Fire and Emergency personnel can effectively access a site and/or structure in an emergency and without compromising the egress of residents escaping the site or other emergency services such as St John and Police.  This relief supports the subsequent relief sought below in relation to the design and location of access including the provision of pedestrian access where no vehicle access is to be provided.	Amend as follows:  TPT-P6: Access and egress  Manage the number, location, and design of access and egress points to support all of the following:  a) safety and amenity for pedestrians and cyclists to and from the site and along the street frontage; b) visibility of vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists when exiting the site; c) efficient access to the site to minimise queuing within the integrated transportation network, and d) safe and efficient operation of intersections., <u>and</u> e) <u>safe and efficient emergency service access and egress.</u>	Open Submission

# TPT - Transport

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Rules Table	Alec Duncan	288.27	Support	Supports TPT-R1 insofar that it requires access in all zones to comply with standards TPT-S1 – TPT-S6. Activities that do not comply with TPT-R1 require resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity and are subject to the relevant matters of discretion for the standard infringed. This rule is supported, subject to the relief sought to TPT-S1 – TPT-S6 being accepted.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Rules Table	Alec Duncan	288.28	Amend	Supports TPT-R2 insofar that resource consent is required for new or modified vehicle access and crossings onto a state highway or arterial road as a restricted discretionary activity. However, Fire and Emergency request an additional matter of discretion to allow consideration of the provision of emergency service access, where applicable.	<p><b>Amend as follows:</b></p> <p><b>TPT-R2: New or modified vehicle access and crossings onto a state highway or arterial road</b></p> <p><b>Activity Status:</b> Residential Discretionary</p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are:</b></p> <p>...</p> <p>4. The provision of onsite manoeuvring areas, <u>and</u></p> <p>5. The cumulative effect of land uses requiring access to a state highway or arterial road, <u>and</u></p> <p>6. <u>The provision of emergency service access.</u></p>	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Rules Table	Alec Duncan	288.29	Support	This rule is supported, subject to the relief sought to TPT-S1 – TPT-S4 and TPT-S6 being accepted.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Rules Table	Alec Duncan	288.30	Support	This rule is supported, subject to the relief sought to TPT-S6 being accepted.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	Alec Duncan	288.31	Amend			Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	Alec Duncan	288.32	Support	<p>Any carriageway with a dead end needs a turnaround area so that emergency vehicles do not have to do multi-point turns to turn around. This is so Fire and Emergency personnel can move their vehicles quickly in an emergency to protect them. Fire and Emergency vehicles need to be able to turn a full 360° within a 25m circle (wall-to-wall clearance) to meet Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency requirements. The minimum turning radius of turnaround areas should be no less than 11.3m for pumping vehicles and 12.5m for aerial vehicles.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency supports the provision of onsite manoeuvring areas being in accordance with Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency's Road and traffic guidelines for New Zealand on-road tracking curves for heavy motor vehicles (RTS 18). This aligns with the requirements for Fire and Emergency's fire appliances as set out in the Designers' guide to firefighting operations Emergency vehicle access F5-02 GD.</p> <p>This supports the ability for fire appliances to manoeuvre quickly on site in an emergency and will avoid the need for fire appliances to reversing onto roads which could compromise the safety and/or efficiency of the integrated transport network.</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table	Alec Duncan	288.33	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency's response time commitments to the government and community are key determinants for the location of new, or the expansion of existing, emergency service facilities (i.e., fire stations). Fire stations therefore need to be strategically located within and throughout communities to maximise their coverage and maintain appropriate response times and efficiently provide for the health and safety of people and communities.</p> <p>TPT-S7 provides for a maximum number of light and heavy vehicle movements in the residential zone, and a slightly higher threshold in all other zones.</p> <p>Given Fire and Emergency's role in protecting the community, emergency service facilities should not be subject to the vehicle trip generation standards (they are not high trip generators) and will only generate vehicle movement during shift change, during emergency response or when training activities are being undertaken onsite. It is considered that all other general transport standards will be sufficient to manage traffic matters, e.g., visibility splays, tracking curves, access design, etc for emergency service facilities.</p> <p>An exemption for emergency service facilities is therefore sought.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>Note: TPT-S7 does not apply to emergency service facilities.</u></p> <p>or similar effect</p>	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Assessment Criteria /TPT-AC4: Infringement of the vehicle access (general) standard (TPT-S4) and manoeuvring standard (TPT-S6) above.	Alec Duncan	288.34	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency understands that the assessment criteria are in addition to the matters of discretion set out against each standard in TPT and that when considering an application, NCC will have regard to the relevant matters of discretion set out in each standard, and regard will also be had to the relevant assessment criteria.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency is supportive of TPT-AC4(a)(iii) which requires that for residential activities, whether the design and layout of the vehicle access and manoeuvring will provide safe, efficient and comfortable living environments including consideration of access for emergency services.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency requests that this is also adopted for TPT-AC4(c) that considers all non-residential activities.</p>	<p>TPT-AC4: Infringement of the vehicle access (general) standard (TPT- S4) and manoeuvring standard (TPT-S6)</p> <p>Functional requirements of the activity</p> <p>...</p> <p>c. For non-residential activities, whether the design and layout of the vehicle access and manoeuvring area will provide for safe and efficient access to the activity, having regard to:</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>iv. The provision of emergency service access and egress.</u></p>	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /General /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.32	Amend	<p>Considers the overlap between these chapters makes it very confusing to understand which infrastructure activities are addressed and in which chapter(s) they are addressed. The overlap between provisions in these chapters also makes it unclear how effects are managed and to understand implications for how the ECO provisions may or may not apply to these activities.</p>	<p>Seeks clarification of what activities are addressed in which chapters.</p> <p>Include provisions for infrastructure that is not a "network utility", "renewable energy generation", "Stormwater" or "transport".</p> <p>Rename the section heading or change section names to Energy, Infrastructure and Transport.</p>	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Introduction /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.64	Oppose	<p>Oppose this chapter. Considers it is not clear why this chapter is needed given the scope of the NU chapter as explained in the TPT introduction.</p> <p>Nor does the introduction recognise the importance of designing transport infrastructure for low emissions.</p>	<p>Seeks clarification on what aspect of Transport is addressed in this chapter.</p> <p>Amend the first sentence of the introduction (or include elsewhere in the Introduction):</p> <p>"The purpose of the Transportation chapter is to manage development to achieve an integrated approach to land use and transportation planning, <u>with a preference for low emission transportation</u>".</p>	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Issues /TPT-I2: Reliance on private motor vehicles may detract from public health and community wellbeing	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.65	Amend	<p>Considers that the issue does not recognise the benefits in terms of reduction in carbon emissions from moving towards active transport modes.</p>	<p>Seeks to include explanation of benefits from a carbon emission perspective of preferring active transport and other low-carbon transport options.</p>	Open Submission

# TPT - Transport

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TPT - Transport /Issues /TPT-I4: Traffic generation may detract from environmental and amenity values	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.66	Amend	Considers that the issue does not recognise the impact of transport on carbon emissions and therefore climate change.	Seeks to include explanation of the importance of reducing carbon-emitting transport in terms of climate change. Alternatively, include a separate issue dealing with this topic.	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /Objectives /TPT-O5: Environmental and amenity values	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.67	Oppose	Opposes objective as it is uncertain and potentially inconsistent with s6 “not detract from” is not the same as “protect.”	Seeks to add:  <u>“and protects natural character, outstanding natural features and landscapes, significant indigenous biodiversity and sites of significance to Māori.”</u>	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /General /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.68	Oppose	Opposes whole chapter, including Introduction, Objectives, Policies and Rules Arising from late notification of ECO-chapter	Seeks to add:  <u>“The Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter includes provisions which relate to transport. Where there is a conflict between the Transport chapter and the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter, the provisions that place greater or additional restrictions on activities with adverse effects on the natural environment will apply”.</u>	Open Submission
TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Rules Table /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.69	Oppose	Considers it is not clear whether the rules provide for activities such as vegetation clearance or earthworks.  As such the rules do not ensure adverse effects within the coastal environment are in accordance with the requirements of the NZCPS. In particular the rules do not give effect to Policies 11, 13 and 15 of the NZCPS. The rules potentially conflict with the ECO chapter provisions.	Seeks to add an advice section before the rules setting out that the earthworks, ECO chapter rules apply.  That the “NU” rules also apply to structures associate with transport activities addressed in the TPT rules and include standards restricting activities within the CE and outstanding area and significant site overlays.	Open Submission

# GMO - Genetically Modified Organisms

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GMO - Genetically Modified Organisms /Issues /GMO-11:	Warren Pearce	213.1	Oppose	Opposes the precautionary approach in the GMO chapter and considers there should be greater control on the release of GMO to protect public health and safety.	Amend Genetically Modified Organisms provisions to be more restrictive	<a href="#">Open Submission</a>
GMO - Genetically Modified Organisms /GMO - Genetically Modified Organisms /General	Leanne Roberts	257.30	Support	No submission made, however it is inferred that the submission is the same as the relief sought.	Supports the precautionary approach to GMO and the consistent approach with Hastings District Council.Supports a precautionary approach based on community conversations.Seeks to retain as proposed. [Inferred Relief Sought]	<a href="#">Open Submission</a>



# HAZS - Hazardous substances

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HAZS - Hazardous substances /HAZS - Hazardous Substances - Rules Table /HAZS-R2: The storage, handling or use of hazardous substances in all other zones (excepting significant hazard facilities)	Tony Michelle	73.8	Support	Supports HAZ-R2 as the management of hazardous substances is adequately managed through the HSNOA Act.	Retain HAZ-R2.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /HAZS - Hazardous Substances - Rules Table /HAZS-R2: The storage, handling or use of hazardous substances in all other zones (excepting significant hazard facilities)	Jimmy Guerin	134.8	Support	Supports HAZ-R2 as the management of hazardous substances is adequately managed through the HSNOA Act.	Retain HAZ-R2.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /General	Ellen Robotham	198.44	Support	Generally supportive of the Hazardous Substances chapter.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Introduction	Georgina McPherson	215.76	Amend	<p>The Fuel Companies support the recognition in the introduction the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 (HSNO) is the primary mechanism for controlling and managing the use and storage of hazardous substances, and that the provisions in this chapter relate only to major hazardous facilities or the use of hazardous substances in the Natural Open Space Zone.</p> <p>The Fuel Companies also agree with the limitations to the control and management of hazardous substances under the RMA as set out in the introduction to this chapter.</p> <p>The terms 'major hazardous facilities' and 'significant hazardous facilities' are both used in this chapter yet have very different meanings. The Proposed Plan does not define the term 'major hazardous facilities'. For certainty, all references in the hazardous substances chapter to major hazardous facilities should be amended to refer to the term 'significant hazardous facilities' as defined in the Proposed Plan.</p>	<p>Amend the introduction to the hazardous substances chapter as follows:</p> <p>The purpose of this chapter is to manage the effects of the use and storage of hazardous substances and of significant hazardous facilities that <del>exist fall</del> outside of the scope of the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996. HSNO provides the general framework and is the primary mechanism for controlling and managing the use and storage of hazardous substances, but the following matters fall within the scope of the RMA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Effects on sensitive areas, such as the coastal and estuarine environment;</li> <li>2. Reverse sensitivity issues between existing lawfully established facilities and new or intensified sensitive activities;</li> <li>3. Any residual risk to public safety, including risks to the public beyond the site boundary and from the storage of hazardous substances that could be affected during a natural hazard event, and</li> <li>4. Management of cumulative effects of multiple <del>major</del>-hazard facilities near each other.</li> </ol> <p>The provisions in this chapter address the above matters as they relate to <del>major hazard facilities and</del> the storage, handling, or use of hazardous substances only in the Natural Open Space Zone <u>and significant hazardous facilities.</u></p>	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Issues /HAZS-I1: Adverse effects on the natural environment and the community	Georgina McPherson	215.77	Amend	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this issue.	Retain HAZS-I1 as notified.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Issues /HAZS-I2: Adverse effects of hazardous substances on sensitive environments	Georgina McPherson	215.78	Support	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this issue.	Retain HAZS-I2 as notified.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Issues /HAZS-I3: Protection from residual effects and risks beyond the site boundary	Georgina McPherson	215.79	Support	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this issue.	Retain HAZS-I3 as notified.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Issues /HAZS-I4: Cumulative effects of major hazard facilities	Georgina McPherson	215.80	Amend	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this issue however suggest amendments to improve its clarity to address the potential for escalation of risk where an emergency incident at one hazardous facility is exacerbated by proximity to another hazardous facility.	<p>Amend HAZS-I4 as follows:</p> <p>HAZS-I4: Cumulative effects of <del>major significant</del> hazardous facilities</p> <p>Napier's geographic and zoning constraints in relation to industrial activities may result in multiple <del>major significant</del> hazardous facilities located in close proximity to one another <u>creating the potential for cumulative effects to the environment, property and the community during an emergency incident affecting more than one significant hazardous facility.</u> <del>In these circumstances, During any natural or human created hazard event this may result in hazardous substances used and/or stored within these facilities mixing, which may potentially cause unanticipated significant hazards to the environment, to property, and to the community.</del></p>	Open Submission

# HAZS - Hazardous substances

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Objectives /HAZS-O1: Adverse effects on the natural environment and the community	Georgina McPherson	215.81	Oppose	Opposes the objective as written due to unnecessary duplication of the HSNO Act. If this objective is retained it should be amended to ensure a logical flow from HAZS-I1, to HAZ-O1 and on to policy HAZS-P1 by being framed in terms of sensitive natural environments.	Amend objective HAZS-O1 as follows:HAZS-O1: Adverse effects on <del>sensitive</del> the natural environments and the community <del>The Sensitive</del> natural environments and the community are protected from unacceptable levels of <del>risk the adverse effects</del> associated with hazardous substances.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Objectives /HAZS-O3: Risk and reverse sensitivity effects	Georgina McPherson	215.82	Amend	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this objective. However, risk is inherent to the storage of hazardous substances and, while the Fuel Companies operate their facilities in accordance with HSNO and WorkSafe regulations and industry best practice to minimise risk to the extent practicable, risk cannot be entirely avoided. The key issue is the acceptability of any residual risk from significant hazardous facilities to surrounding land uses. In addition, there is also an error where it refers to 'significant hazard facilities' it should refer to it as worded in the definitions section 'Significant Hazardous Facilities.'	Amend HAZS-O3 to focus on the acceptability of risk to surrounding land uses, rather than a requirement to avoid risk entirely. This could be achieved by making the following changes, or to the same effect: HAZS-O3 Sensitive activities are located <u>where they are not exposed to an unacceptable level of risk from established significant hazardous facilities and</u> so that any reverse sensitivity effects <u>on and risks associated with</u> established significant hazardous facilities are avoided.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Objectives /HAZS-O4: Cumulative effects	Georgina McPherson	215.83	Amend	Oppose objective due to unnecessary duplication with requirements of HSNO Act. Provisions should focus on the extent to which there is any potential for exacerbation of risk and/or adverse effects through the location of significant hazardous facilities in close proximity to one another.	Amend HAZS-O4 as follows: <del>Hazardous substances within significant hazard facilities are used and/or stored in such a way that the risk of these substances mixing, either within the site or from nearby major hazard facilities, is minimised.</del> <u>Significant hazardous facilities are located and managed so they do not result in unacceptable levels of cumulative risk to people, property or the environment.</u>	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Policies /HAZS-P1: Adverse effects of hazardous substances on sensitive environments	Georgina McPherson	215.84	Support	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this policy and seek that it be retained.	Retain as notified:	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Policies /HAZS-P2: Enable activities that utilise hazardous substances in appropriate locations	Georgina McPherson	215.85	Amend	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this policy. However, given there is inherent risk associated with the storage and handling of hazardous substances, the wording should be amended to focus on the acceptability of risk. In addition, the Fuel Companies consider the policy should focus on the management of significant hazardous facilities, rather than their control.	Amend Policy HAZS-P2 as follows: Ensure that significant hazard facilities are appropriately located and <del>controlled managed</del> in order to reduce risks to the environment and community <u>to acceptable levels.</u>	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Policies /HAZS-P3: Risk and reverse sensitivity effects	Georgina McPherson	215.86	Amend	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this policy, however, feel that the intensification of existing sensitive activities within proximity to major hazard facilities should also be covered. For example, additional residential units on existing properties within the Significant Hazardous Facility Risk Management Overlay should be avoided.	Amend Policy HAZS-P3 as follows:Avoid <u>new</u> sensitive activities locating in <u>and existing sensitive activities intensifying within</u> proximity to major hazard facilities to ensure that any reverse sensitivity effects and residual risks are controlled.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Policies /HAZS-P4: Cumulative effects	Georgina McPherson	215.87	Support	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this policy.	Retain HAZS-P4 as notified.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /HAZS - Hazardous Substances - Rules Table /HAZS-R1: The storage, handling, or use of hazardous substances (excepting arsenic (As) and significant hazard facilities) within the Natural Open Space Zone	Georgina McPherson	215.88	Support	The Fuel Companies support the permitted activity status and rule conditions in HAZS-R1 and seek that it be retained.	Retain HAZS-R1A and HAZS-R1B as notified.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /HAZS - Hazardous Substances - Rules Table /HAZS-R2: The storage, handling or use of hazardous substances in all other zones (excepting significant hazard facilities)	Georgina McPherson	215.89	Support	The Fuel Companies support the permitted activity status in HAZS-R2 and seek that it be retained.	Retain HAZS-R2 as notified.	Open Submission

# HAZS - Hazardous substances

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HAZS - Hazardous substances /HAZS - Hazardous Substances - Rules Table /HAZS-R3: Significant hazard facilities	Georgina McPherson	215.90	Support	The Fuel Companies can support a discretionary activity status for new significant hazardous facilities. However, provision should be made for additions or alterations to existing significant hazardous facilities that do not increase the risk profile of the facility to occur as a permitted activity.	Amend HAZS-R3 to apply only to new significant hazardous facilities or additions or alterations to existing significant hazardous facilities that result in an increase in the risk profile of the facility. And include a new rule to provide for additions and alterations to existing significant hazardous facilities that do not increase the risk profile to occur as a permitted activity. This could be achieved by making the following changes, or changes to the same effect:  <u>New Rule HAZS-RX: Additions or alterations that do not increase the risk profile of an existing significant hazardous facility</u> <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u> <u>HAZS-R3: New Significant hazardous facilities and additions or alterations that increase the risk profile of an existing significant hazardous facility</u> <u>Activity Status: Discretionary</u>	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /HAZS - Hazardous Substances - Rules Table /HAZS-R4: New sensitive activities located within the Major Hazard Facility Risk Management Overlay	Georgina McPherson	215.91	Amend	The Fuel Companies support the intent of HAZS-R4, however seek that 'new residential units' within the Major Hazard Facility Risk Management Overlay are specifically included as a non-complying activity. This is because the development of an additional residential unit (such as an additional household within an existing residential property) is considered to introduce additional sensitive activities at a threshold that could affect the existing risk profile of the Terminals, but which might not otherwise be considered to be a new sensitive activity under the definition of that term (which simply refers to 'residential activity').	Amend HAZS-R4 to ensure it applies to additional residential units established at existing residential property within the Major Hazard Facility Risk Management Overlay. This could be achieved by making changes along the following lines: <u>HAZS-R4: New sensitive activities, including additional residential units at established residential activities</u> , located within the Major Hazard Facility Risk Management Overlay. <u>Note: For the purposes of this rule, 'new sensitive activities' includes any additional residential unit established at a property within the Major Hazard Facility Risk Management Overlay in addition to the number of residential units existing at the date of notification of this plan.</u> Activity Status: Non-complying	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Assessment criteria /General Risk assessment	Georgina McPherson	215.92	Amend	The Fuel Companies support the assessment criteria, with the exception of clause f) relating to the consideration of alternative locations. It is inappropriate to require the consideration of alternative locations for existing activities or any proposed extension or expansion. This does not recognise the level of investment in existing Significant Hazardous Facilities. here is also a minor editorial error that should be corrected.	Amend HAZS – Assessment criteria correct the numbering and amend the criterion relating to alternative locations as follows: Assessment criteria...General Risk assessment a. The probability ... i. spill containment measures; ii. ... iii.  e.f. The record of compliance and acceptable risk management of any existing activity where expansion of the activity is proposed. Alternative locations f.g. The inclusion of evidence that alternative locations <del>for the existing activity or any proposed extension or expansion</del> have been considered <u>for any new Significant Hazardous Facility or sensitive activity likely to result in significant adverse effects or unacceptable levels of risk, having particular regard to locations both within the site and outside the site.</u>	Open Submission

# HAZS - Hazardous substances

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Issues /HAZS-I1: Adverse effects on the natural environment and the community	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.39	Amend	The submitter considers HAZS-I1: Adverse effects on the natural environment and the community should be amended as the deletion of the proposed definition for 'Significant Hazardous Facilities' has been requested and therefore, as a consequential amendment the removal of this term, or rather the term 'Major Hazardous Facilities', from within this issue is required. In making the above request, it is noted that the PDP seems to be using the terms 'Significant Hazardous Facility' and 'Major Hazardous Facility' interchangeably, and therefore incorrectly, as the PDP, as notified only proposed a definition for 'Significant Hazardous Facility'.	Amend Issue HAZS-I1 as follows: Hazardous substances are used in a wide range of activities occurring within Napier city, from dry-cleaning clothes and manufacturing industrial products to controlling pests and plant diseases in the agricultural sector. Although necessary to provide for the many functions of a city, the use of hazardous substances creates the potential for adverse effects on human health, property, or the natural environment. <del>Activities that use and storage of hazardous substances, and major hazardous facilities</del> must be located in appropriate areas and managed in an appropriate manner to avoid or minimise their effects on sensitive environments.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Issues /HAZS-I2: Adverse effects of hazardous substances on sensitive environments	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.40	Oppose	Opposes HAZS - Hazardous substances Issues HAZS-I2: Adverse effects of hazardous substances on sensitive environments as it largely repeats the matters outlined in Issue HAZS-I1 in terms of sensitive environments and the need to appropriately managed the storage and use of hazardous substances. In addition, the focus of this issue seems to be related to stormwater discharges into these sensitive environments. Issues addressed with stormwater discharges should be addressed within the 'SW – Stormwater' section of the PDP.	Delete Issue HAZS-I2 in its entirety as follows: <del>Approximately 70% of Napier's stormwater is eventually discharged into Te Whanga (the Ahuriri estuary), while the remainder is discharged to the sea, both of which are considered sensitive environments. Activities that use and store hazardous substances, particularly major hazard facilities, have a risk of contaminating these environments if not properly managed.</del>	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Issues /HAZS-I3: Protection from residual effects and risks beyond the site boundary	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.42	Amend	Considers Issue HAZS-I3: Protection from residual effects and risks beyond the site boundary should be amended as the deletion of the proposed definition for 'Significant Hazardous Facilities' has been requested, and therefore, as a consequential amendment the removal of this term, as well as the term 'Major Hazardous Facilities', from within this issue is also required. In addition, as noted above in relation to Issue HAZS-I1, the PDP seems to be using the terms 'Significant Hazardous Facility' and 'Major Hazardous Facility' interchangeably, and therefore incorrectly, as the PDP, as notified only proposed a definition for 'Significant Hazardous Facility'.	Amend Issue HAZS-I3 as follows: <del>Not all activities that store and use hazardous substances</del> significant hazard facilities can contain their adverse effects and risks within their site boundaries. Where residual risks remain on nearby properties, a change in use or intensification of sensitive activities may result in this risk becoming unacceptable or these sensitive activities impacting on the ability of <del>major hazardous</del> these facilities to operate.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Objectives /HAZS-O1: Adverse effects on the natural environment and the community	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.43	Support	Supports Objective HAZS-O1: Adverse effects on the natural environment and the community as it is agreed that the storage and use of hazardous substances, has the potential, if not appropriately controlled and managed, to adversely affect the environment and the community. For this reason, this objective is supported.	Retain Objective HAZS-O1 as notified.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Objectives /HAZS-O2: Enable activities that use and store hazardous substances in appropriate locations	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.44	Amend	The submitter considers that Objective HAZS-O2: Enable activities that use and store hazardous substances in appropriate locations should be amended as Ravensdown's three sites in the city, store and use hazardous substances. Therefore, ensuring that industrial activities are appropriately located within industrial zones, and that the storage and use of hazardous substances is these zones are managed and controlled in accordance with the requirements of HSNOA and its various regulations, is an appropriate land use planning approach. For this reason, this objective is supported. However, the deletion of the proposed definition for 'Significant Hazardous Facilities' has been requested, and therefore, as a consequential amendment - the removal of this term, as well as the term 'Major Hazardous Facilities', from within this objective is also required.	Amend Objective HAZS-O2 as follows: Enable activities that use and store hazardous substances, <del>including major hazard facilities</del> , in appropriate locations where effects on the natural environment and community can be avoided or mitigated.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Objectives /HAZS-O3: Risk and reverse sensitivity effects	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.45	Amend	Considers that Objective HAZS-O3: Risk and reverse sensitivity effects should be amended as the deletion of the proposed definition for 'Significant Hazardous Facilities' has been requested, and therefore, as a consequential amendment the removal of this term from within this Objective is also required.	Amend Objective HAZS-O3 as follows: Sensitive activities are located so that any reverse sensitivity effects and risks associated with established <del>significant hazard facilities</del> <u>activities that store and use hazardous substances</u> are avoided.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Objectives /HAZS-O4: Cumulative effects	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.46	Oppose	Opposes Objective HAZS-O4: Cumulative effects for the same reasons as outlined above in relation to Issue HAZS-I4 and given the requested deletion of Issue HAZS-I4, the deletion of this objective is also necessary.	Delete Objective HAZS-O4 in its entirety as follows: <del>Hazardous substances within significant hazard facilities are used and/or stored in such a way that the risk of these substances mixing, either within the site or from nearby major hazard facilities, is minimised.</del>	Open Submission

# HAZS - Hazardous substances

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Policies /HAZS-P1: Adverse effects of hazardous substances on sensitive environments	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.47	Support	Supports Policy HAZS-P1: Adverse effects of hazardous substances on sensitive environments as given that the Natural Open Space Zones are associated with identified sensitive environments, this Policy is supported.	Retain Policy HAZS-P1 as notified.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Policies /HAZS-P2: Enable activities that utilise hazardous substances in appropriate locations	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.48	Amend	The submitter considers that Policy HAZS-P2: Enable activities that utilise hazardous substances in appropriate locations should be amended as the deletion of the proposed definition for 'Significant Hazardous Facilities' has been requested, and therefore as a consequential amendment the removal of this term from within this particular Policy is also required.	Amend Policy HAZS-P2 as follows: Ensure that <del>significant hazard</del> <u>facilities that store and use hazardous substances</u> are appropriately located and controlled in order to reduce risks to the environment and community.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Issues /HAZS-I4: Cumulative effects of major hazard facilities	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.49	Oppose	Opposes Issue HAZS-I4: Cumulative effects of major hazard facilities as natural hazard and zoning issues should be traversed in other relevant chapters of the PDP, and as Issue HAZS-I1 traverses the need for appropriate management and control of hazardous substances, this issue is out of place and thus not needed and should be deleted.	Delete Issue HAZS-I4 in its entirety as follows: <del>Napier's geographic and zoning constraints in relation to industrial activities may result in multiple major hazard facilities located in close proximity to one another. In these circumstances, any natural or human created hazard event may result in hazardous substances used and/or stored within these facilities mixing, which may cause unanticipated significant hazards to the environment, to property, and to the community.</del>	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Policies /HAZS-P3: Risk and reverse sensitivity effects	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.50	Amend	The submitter considers HAZS-P3: Risk and sensitivity effects should be amended as zone provisions, particularly for industrial activities appropriately located in industrial zones, should be in place to ensure that sensitive activities are managed to ensure that they do not give rise to reverse sensitivity effects on industrial activities in industrial zones. For this reason, rules in this chapter of the PDP in response to this policy are not necessary. In addition, the deletion of the proposed definition for 'Significant Hazardous Facilities' has been requested and therefore as a consequential amendment the removal of this term from within this Policy is also required.	Amend Policy HAZS-P3 as follows: Avoid sensitive activities locating in proximity to <del>major hazard facilities</del> <u>appropriate located activities that store and use hazardous substances</u> , to ensure that any reverse sensitivity effects and residual risks are controlled.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Policies /HAZS-P4: Cumulative effects	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.51	Oppose	Opposes Policy HAZS-P4: Cumulative effects as for the same reasons as outlined in relation to Issue HAZS-I4 and Objective HAZS-O4, and given the requested deletion of Issue HAZS-I4 and Objective HAZS-O4, the deletion of this Policy is also required.	Delete Policy HAZS-P4 in its entirety as follows: <del>Identify, assess, and manage cumulative effects of significant hazard facilities so they do not increase to unacceptable levels of risk to people, property, and the environment.</del>	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /HAZS - Hazardous Substances - Rules Table	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.52	Amend	The submitter considers that HAZS - Hazardous Substances - Rules Table should be amended as the introduction to the rule table identifies that the storage and use of hazardous substances must also comply with two of Councils' bylaws and the 'Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure'. The identification of other 'regulations' that must be complied with is supported. However, in this context, it is considered that this list should also refer to HSNOA and associated regulations. HSNOA and its associated regulation are the primary mechanisms in New Zealand for the management and control of hazardous substance transport, storage and use in New Zealand.	Amend Clause (1) under the heading 'HAZS – Hazardous Substances – Rules Table' as follows: 1. Activities must also comply with: <u>a. The Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 and associated regulations that apply to the storage and use of hazardous substances.</u> <del>ab. the Napier City ...</del>	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /HAZS - Hazardous Substances - Rules Table /HAZS-R1: The storage, handling, or use of hazardous substances (excepting arsenic (As) and significant hazard facilities) within the Natural Open Space Zone	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.53	Amend	Considers that HAZS-R1: The storage, handling, or use of hazardous substances (excepting arsenic (As) and significant hazard facilities) within the Natural Open Space Zone should be amended as the deletion of the proposed definition for 'significant hazardous facilities' has been requested, and therefore, as a consequential amendment, the removal of this term from within this Rule is also required. In this context, it is also important to acknowledge that large scale activities that store and use hazardous substances are unlikely to be able to establish in the zone given the activity status likely to apply to such activities (i.e., non-complying or prohibited).	Amend Rule HAZS-R1 as follows: HAZS-R1: The storage, handling, or use of hazardous substances (excepting arsenic (As) <del>and significant hazard facilities</del> ) within the Natural Open Space Zone. ...	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /HAZS - Hazardous Substances - Rules Table /HAZS-R2: The storage, handling or use of hazardous substances in all other zones (excepting significant hazard facilities)	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.54	Amend	Considers that HAZS-R2: The storage, handling or use of hazardous substances in all other zones (excepting significant hazard facilities) should be amended as given the requested deletion of the proposed definition for 'Significant Hazardous Facilities', the removal of the exception for 'Significant Hazard Facilities' from this Rule is also required.	Amend Rule HAZS-R2 as follows: HAZS-R2: The storage, handling or use of hazardous substances in all other zones ( <del>excepting significant hazard facilities</del> ) Activity Status: Permitted	Open Submission

# HAZS - Hazardous substances

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HAZS - Hazardous substances /HAZS - Hazardous Substances - Rules Table /HAZS-R3: Significant hazard facilities	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.55	Oppose	Opposes Rule HAZS-R3: Significant hazard facilities as given requested changes to permitted activity Rule HAZS-R2 and the requested deletion of the definition for 'Significant Hazard Facilities' requiring resource consents for such facilities is opposed.	Delete Rule HAZS-R3 in its entirety as follows: <del>HAZS-R3: Significant hazard facilities</del> <del>Activity Status: Discretionary</del>	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /HAZS - Hazardous Substances /General	Leanne Roberts	257.31	Support	HortNZ supports the approach to hazardous substance management with a focus on matters that fall within the scope of the RMA such as reverse sensitivity, residual risks and major hazard facilities.	Seeks to retain HASZ Hazardous substances.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Objectives /HAZS-O2: Enable activities that use and store hazardous substances in appropriate locations	Leanne Roberts	257.32	Support	Considers horticulture growers use and store hazardous substances but need to meet requirements under HSNO and Health and Safety at Work legislation and regulations as well as meeting industry quality assurance requirements which ensure appropriate locations.	Seeks to Retain HASZ-O2.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Policies /HAZS-P2: Enable activities that utilise hazardous substances in appropriate locations	Leanne Roberts	257.33	Support	Considers the policy implements HASZ-O2.	Seeks to retain HASZ-P2.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /HAZS - Hazardous Substances - Rules Table /HAZS-R2: The storage, handling or use of hazardous substances in all other zones (excepting significant hazard facilities)	Leanne Roberts	257.34	Support	A permitted activity status is supported for the rural zones.	Seeks to retain HASZ-R2.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Objectives /HAZS-O1: Adverse effects on the natural environment and the community	Alec Duncan	288.35	Support	Supports HAZS-O1 to the extent that the PDP seeks to manage adverse effects associated with hazardous substances and protect the natural environment and the community from these effects.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Objectives /HAZS-O2: Enable activities that use and store hazardous substances in appropriate locations	Alec Duncan	288.36	Support	Emergency service facilities and associated firefighting activities involve the use and storage of hazardous substances at quantities that are considered minor. However, there are circumstances where Fire and Emergency needs to temporarily store large quantities of product in an emergency. Fire and Emergency are supportive of this objective to the extent that it seeks to enable activities that use and store hazardous substances in appropriate locations where effects on the natural environment and community can be avoided or mitigated. Fire and Emergency notes that Fire and Emergency operate all emergency responses under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 and Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 regulations. These regulations include storage, secondary containment, handling, packaging, signage, labelling, emergency management etc.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Policies /HAZS-P2: Enable activities that utilise hazardous substances in appropriate locations	Alec Duncan	288.37	Amend	This policy is supported, subject to the relief sought to the 'significant hazard facility' definition being accepted.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /HAZS - Hazardous Substances - Rules Table /HAZS-R1: The storage, handling, or use of hazardous substances (excepting arsenic (As) and significant hazard facilities) within the Natural Open Space Zone	Alec Duncan	288.38	Amend	Fire and Emergency supports the management of the storage, handling, or use of hazardous substances within the Natural Open Space Zone. For reasons set out in submission point 10 above, Fire and Emergency request that the incidental use and storage (including for disposal) of hazardous substances for emergency service activities are exempt from the requirement of HAZS-R1A (1) and (2).	Amend as follows: 1. All hazardous substances are stored and handled on areas with impervious surfaces, apart from the following activities which do not need to be on impervious surfaces: a. fuel operated machinery and vehicles; b. the storage and conveyance of gas or oil in pipelines that are part of a network utility, and c. temporary military training activity. d. <u>the incidental use and storage (including for disposal) of hazardous substances for emergency service activities.</u> 2. All areas within a site where hazardous substances are stored, used, handled, or produced are sealed and banded and able to contain 110% of the total volume of substances stored and used on site in the event of a spill, apart from temporary military training activities and emergency service activities which do not need to be sealed and banded.	Open Submission
HAZS - Hazardous substances /HAZS - Hazardous Substances - Rules Table /HAZS-R3: Significant hazard facilities	Alec Duncan	288.39	Amend	This rule is supported, subject to the relief sought to the 'significant hazard facility' definition being accepted. Fire and Emergency supports the discretionary activity status for significant hazardous facilities. This provides NCC full discretion to assess the associated risk to the environment and assess whether the risk mitigation and management proposed is adequate.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

# HAZS - Hazardous substances

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HAZS - Hazardous substances /Assessment criteria /General	Alec Duncan	288.40	Support	Fire and Emergency supports the assessment criteria to the extent that it provides Council guidance on relevant assessment matters to be considered for activities that require resource consent for the storage, handling or use of hazardous substances and significant hazard facilities. Fire and Emergency specifically support the consideration of fire safety and fire water management, emergency management, site drainage and off-site infrastructure (e.g., stormwater drainage system, sewer type and capacity) and the disposal of waste containing hazardous substances.	Retain as notified.	<a href="#">Open Submission</a>

# NH - Natural Hazards

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NH - Natural Hazards //	Wayne Ormsby	63.1	Amend	Request robust and transparent engagement on the natural hazards chapter.	Seeks to be involved at the variation of the Natural Hazards chapter .For the Indigenous Biodiversity chapter, Council should continue to adopt an approach that aligns with the NPS:IB and is sensible with regards to conservation approaches.	Open Submission
NH - Natural Hazards /NH - Natural Hazards /	Rebecca Eng	99.55	Support	Transpower supports a variation to the PDP in relation to Natural Hazards. Transpower notes the submission points made in the balance of this submission have been made without the benefit of the Natural Hazards provisions and therefore Transpower reserves its position on the lodged submission points in so far as they relate to Natural Hazards.In terms of any future variation, Transpower would support the following be included in the variation:- Explicit policy recognition and rule framework for the ongoing operation, maintenance and minor upgrading of physical infrastructure.- Policy recognition of the operational and technical constraints for new infrastructure and the potential need to locate in hazard areas where the activity can be designed accordingly.- A restricted discretionary activity status for new network utility structures located within the Hazard Area. It would be useful to have a matter of discretion which reflects the operation and technical constraints of the network.	Seeks to enable submitters to update other submission points in so far as they are relevant to Natural Hazards.	Open Submission
NH - Natural Hazards /NH - Natural Hazards /General	Nichola Nicholson	264.6	Amend	Considers the natural hazards and risk chapter essential to the PDP. The risks created by potential natural hazards are a significant issue in Napier and should be addressed through appropriate plan provisions.	Amend PDP to Include of objectives, policies, and rules to manage indigenous natural hazards and risks in Napier.	Open Submission
NH - Natural Hazards /NH - Natural Hazards /General	Alan Petersen	272.1	Amend	Considers with regards to the NH – Natural Hazards Section that it is of concern that on the last day of lodging submissions on the Proposed District Plan that in HB Today is an article “Coastal flood maps affect thousands of properties”. This will impact on many sections of the PDP. But one aspect is to include minimum habitable floor levels in the rules of those areas identified as having flooding risks.	Seeks the following amendments:  Submission 1 – That minimum habitable floor levels be introduced for flood risk areas into the rules of the PDP. That this be 0.5m above the minimum ground levels.  Submission 2 – Make all other amendments to the sections in the PDP – Introductions, Issues, Objectives, Policies, Rules, Standards and Assessment criteria - that are required to implement the matters arising from the “Coastal flood maps”.	Open Submission
NH - Natural Hazards /NH - Natural Hazards /	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.70	Oppose	Concerned that provisions within the currently notified plan may be inconsistent with achieving the objectives of the natural hazards chapter.	Seeks to Ensure that the scope of the variation of the NH chapter provisions includes the SD chapters and the Infrastructure chapters so that submission can be made on those chapters with respect to Natural hazards.	Open Submission
NH - Natural Hazards /NH - Natural Hazards /	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.71	Oppose	Opposes the whole chapter, including Introduction, Objectives, Policies and RulesArising from late notification of ECO-chapter	Seeks to add:  “The Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter includes provisions which relate to natural hazards. Where there is a conflict between the Natural Hazards chapter and the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter, the provisions that place greater or additional restrictions on activities with adverse effects on the natural environment will apply”.	Open Submission



# PKA - Papakainga

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PKA - Papakainga /Policies /PKA-P1: Provision for papakāinga development on whenua Māori	Wayne Ormsby	63.5	Amend	Supports PKA-P1 however requests that it be amended to provide for a two year rates remission for papakāinga development.	Amend PKA-P1 to provide for a two year rates remission for papakāinga development.	Open Submission
PKA - Papakainga /Introduction /	Sera Chambers	150.109	Oppose	opposes on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to enjoy their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their right to have their say on how a development may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated. In particular four of the areas listed, two are established low-lying liquefaction effected residential areas, one is located in a low-lying flood affected area and one is part of a reserve. Risks may need to be mitigated.	seeks to oppose provision on the basis that of four of the areas listed, two are established low-lying liquefaction effected residential areas, one is located in a low-lying flood affected area and one is part of a reserve. Risks may need to be mitigated.	Open Submission
PKA - Papakainga /Introduction /General	Development Nous Limited - Phil Stickney	280.3	Amend	The introduction highlights the importance of Papakāinga and of importance to MAT is the scope of the relationship of development to the land (be that Māori whenua land or land that Māori have an ancestral relationship with but is in general title). The Introduction to the PKA provisions appears to reflect that as they clearly state that PKA provisions apply to land that is whenua land or on land with an ancestral connection. This is appropriately acknowledged as being important in respect of Policy 1.a.ii of the NPS-UD 2020. However, the Introduction then sets a direction of being more enabling on land that has been declared as whenua land under the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 but then places general title under a caveat of "under certain circumstances". This is not considered a reasonable application of Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. The Introduction seemingly separates the 2 classes of landholdings despite acknowledging the importance of an ancestral connection. This has the effect in the rules that give effect to PKA of restricting the enablement of establishing such activities on sites that are in general title. MAT seeks that this be meaningfully addressed and clarify that the PKA provisions apply over all land and that is also translated into the relevant rules and standards in the PKA chapter.	Amend/clarify the Introduction to give effect to the relief sought and remove the distinction for development of Papakāinga in respect of land that is not identified under the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993.	Open Submission
PKA - Papakainga /Policies /PKA-P1: Provision for papakāinga development on whenua Māori3	Development Nous Limited - Phil Stickney	280.4	Amend	The Submitter seeks to have clarity over the nature of landholdings that the development of Papakāinga can be undertaken on. The Submitter supports PKA-P2 which expressly seeks to enable the development of papakāinga on general title within the City. Similarly, the Submitter supports the intent of PKA-P1 which relates directly to the development of Māori land and the ability to develop Papakāinga on those sites. The Submitter further supports the intent of PKA- P5 which seeks to enable commercial and small-scale industrial activities as part of a papakāinga development. However, it is not considered necessary or reasonable to separate the general title and Māori land into separate policies given the relief that The Submitter seeks.	Amend the Policies in PKA-P1 and PKA-P2 to link all land tenures to enabling papakāinga developments with an all- encompassing policy which does not distinguish between land tenure and classifications under legislation.	Open Submission
PKA - Papakainga /Policies /PKA-P2: Provision for papakāinga on General Title	Development Nous Limited - Phil Stickney	280.5	Amend	The Submitter seeks to have clarity over the nature of landholdings that the development of Papakāinga can be undertaken on. The Submitter supports PKA-P2 which expressly seeks to enable the development of papakāinga on general title within the City. Similarly, the Submitter supports the intent of PKA-P1 which relates directly to the development of Māori land and the ability to develop Papakāinga on those sites. The Submitter further supports the intent of PKA- P5 which seeks to enable commercial and small-scale industrial activities as part of a papakāinga development. However, it is not considered necessary or reasonable to separate the general title and Māori land into separate policies given the relief that The Submitter seeks.	Amend the Policies in PKA-P1 and PKA-P2 to link all land tenures to enabling papakāinga developments with an all- encompassing policy which does not distinguish between land tenure and classifications under legislation.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PKA - Papakainga /PKA - Papakainga - Rules Table /PKA-R2: Papakāinga	Development Nous Limited - Phil Stickney	280.6	Amend	Rule PKA-R2 applies to a number of zones and those are considered appropriate as an underlying extent upon which papakāinga can be enabled. However, the matters of control in PKA-R2A split the consent status depending upon the land tenure. This undermines the enabling narrative contained within the Introduction to the Zone and fails to recognise land that may be returned to Iwi under a redress or acquisitions settlement process as a result of previous acquisition or alienation. It is also considered unduly restrictive to render an activity on general title to be a Discretionary Activity whereas development on Māori land is rendered a Controlled Activity if it complies with the standards and restricted Discretionary if it does not. The rules are driven by land tenure as opposed to the substantive environmental effects that must be either avoided, remedied or mitigated. It is not considered that land tenure of itself should be the arbiter of an activity status for a development.	Amend Rules PKA-R2A, PKA-R2B and PKA-R3A, PKA-R3B to remove the distinction between land tenure and apply consistency of provisions as a Controlled Activity where all standards are met and a Restricted Discretionary status where activity standards are not met regardless of the land tenure underpinning the activity.	Open Submission
PKA - Papakainga /PKA - Papakainga - Rules Table /PKA-R3: Industrial and commercial buildings and activities associated with papakāinga	Development Nous Limited - Phil Stickney	280.7	Amend	<p>Rule PKA-R2 applies to a number of zones and those are considered appropriate as an underlying extent upon which papakāinga can be enabled. However, the matters of control in PKA-R2A split the consent status depending upon the land tenure. This undermines the enabling narrative contained within the Introduction to the Zone and fails to recognise land that may be returned to Iwi under a redress or acquisitions settlement process as a result of previous acquisition or alienation.</p> <p>It is also considered unduly restrictive to render an activity on general title to be a Discretionary Activity whereas development on Māori land is rendered a Controlled Activity if it complies with the standards and restricted Discretionary if it does not. The rules are driven by land tenure as opposed to the substantive environmental effects that must be either avoided, remedied or mitigated. It is not considered that land tenure of itself should be the arbiter of an activity status for a development.</p> <p>The Submitter notes the same approach taken to commercial and industrial activities within PKA-R3A and PKA-R3B and the same concerns as that for PKA-R1 and PKA-R2 manifest themselves. The Submitter also seeks amendments to PKA-R3A(4) which limits activities in such developments. The Submitter seeks that the rule incorporates the relevant components from the definition sought for a Māori Purpose Activity in this rule as required to give effect to the relief sought by the inclusion of the definition. If multiple buildings/activities are proposed, The Submitter seeks that these are set out as an individual control rather than a cumulative control linked to the number of dwellings.</p>	<p>Amend Rules PKA-R2A, PKA-R2B and PKA-R3A, PKA-R3B to remove the distinction between land tenure and apply consistency of provisions as a Controlled Activity where all standards are met and a Restricted Discretionary status where activity standards are not met regardless of the land tenure underpinning the activity.</p> <p>Amend the provisions of PKA-R3 to enable the activities sought under the definition and any associated amendments to accommodate the relief sought.</p>	Open Submission
PKA - Papakainga /PKA - Papakainga - Standards Table /PKA-S5: Minimum site size	Development Nous Limited - Phil Stickney	280.8	Amend	The standards contained within PKA-S5 to PKA-S7 are suitable for larger sites. The underlying zones over which the standards apply will not, in many instances, render such forms of development as being capable of being achieved, with the result being that they are pushed into a more arduous consenting category. It means that smaller urban sites will not be capable of being enabled as a papakāinga development. The PKA provisions are enabling Papakāinga in more urban zones however the standards as currently drafted do not enable such sites to be developed.	Amend the standards to enable a greater degree of flexibility and relate to the underlying zone as may be appropriate to the site subject to development.	Open Submission
PKA - Papakainga /PKA - Papakainga - Standards Table /PKA-S6: Privacy separation distances	Development Nous Limited - Phil Stickney	280.9	Amend	The standards contained within PKA-S5 to PKA-S7 are suitable for larger sites. The underlying zones over which the standards apply will not, in many instances, render such forms of development as being capable of being achieved, with the result being that they are pushed into a more arduous consenting category. It means that smaller urban sites will not be capable of being enabled as a papakāinga development. The PKA provisions are enabling Papakāinga in more urban zones however the standards as currently drafted do not enable such sites to be developed.	Amend the standards to enable a greater degree of flexibility and relate to the underlying zone as may be appropriate to the site subject to development.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PKA - Papakainga /PKA - Papakainga - Standards Table /PKA-S7: Building coverage	Development Nous Limited - Phil Stickney	280.10	Amend	The standards contained within PKA-S5 to PKA-S7 are suitable for larger sites. The underlying zones over which the standards apply will not, in many instances, render such forms of development as being capable of being achieved, with the result being that they are pushed into a more arduous consenting category. It means that smaller urban sites will not be capable of being enabled as a papakāinga development. The PKA provisions are enabling Papakāinga in more urban zones however the standards as currently drafted do not enable such sites to be developed.	Amend the standards to enable a greater degree of flexibility and relate to the underlying zone as may be appropriate to the site subject to development.	Open Submission
PKA - Papakainga /Assessment criteria /PKA-AC1: Buildings accessory to existing or consented residential buildings (PKA-R1); Papakāinga (PKA-R2); Industrial and commercial Buildings and activities associated with papakāinga (PKA-R3); and Papakāinga, buildings accessory to existing or consented residential buildings, and industrial and commercial buildings and activities associated with papakāinga in all other zones not provided for in Rules PKA-R1-PKA-R3 (PKA-R4)	Development Nous Limited - Phil Stickney	280.11	Oppose	Based upon the points of submission above, the Submitter seeks that PKA-AC1(b) be removed as those criteria are again related to the tenure of the land and which determines the activity status of a development. See attached document for details.	Delete PKA-AC1(b) and (c).	Open Submission
PKA - Papakainga /PKA - Papakainga - Standards Table /PKA-S1: Height	Kainga Ora - Brendon Liggett	285.16	Oppose	Supports the inclusion of provisions relating to papakāinga developments within the PDP; however, Papakāinga developments should be subject to the same activity status and permitted standards, amended in accordance with this submission (see 6(a)(ii) above), as residential activities/dwellings within the GRZ, MRZ and the HRZ. Opposes a tailored maximum height, yard setbacks and building coverage associated with papakāinga.	Opposes a tailored maximum height, yard setbacks and building coverage associated with papakāinga.	Open Submission
PKA - Papakainga /PKA - Papakainga - Standards Table /PKA-S2: Front yards	Kainga Ora - Brendon Liggett	285.17	Oppose	Supports the inclusion of provisions relating to papakāinga developments within the PDP; however, Papakāinga developments should be subject to the same activity status and permitted standards, amended in accordance with this submission (see 6(a)(ii) above), as residential activities/dwellings within the GRZ, MRZ and the HRZ. Opposes a tailored maximum height, yard setbacks and building coverage associated with papakāinga.	Opposes a tailored maximum height, yard setbacks and building coverage associated with papakāinga.	Open Submission
PKA - Papakainga /PKA - Papakainga - Standards Table /PKA-S7: Building coverage	Kainga Ora - Brendon Liggett	285.18	Amend	Supports the inclusion of provisions relating to papakāinga developments within the PDP; however, Papakāinga developments should be subject to the same activity status and permitted standards, amended in accordance with this submission (see 6(a)(ii) above), as residential activities/dwellings within the GRZ, MRZ and the HRZ. Opposes a tailored maximum height, yard setbacks and building coverage associated with papakāinga.	Opposes a tailored maximum height, yard setbacks and building coverage associated with papakāinga.	Open Submission
PKA - Papakainga /PKA - Papakainga - Rules Table /PKA-R2: Papakāinga	Kainga Ora - Brendon Liggett	285.19	Oppose	Supports the inclusion of provisions relating to papakāinga developments within the PDP; however, questions the inclusion under rule PKA-R2A of a requirement for general title land to have been held in ancestral ownership 'continuously' since the declaration. Seeks that the provisions reduce the barriers that Māori face in the development of papakāinga, acknowledging that general title land may be owned by Māori, but this may not have been 'continuously' as the proposed provisions requires. Requests amendments to the wording of these provisions to reduce the regulatory barriers, following further hui with Mana Whenua and Council.	Amend the wording of these provisions to reduce the regulatory barriers, following further hui with Mana Whenua and Council.	Open Submission
PKA - Papakainga /Objectives /PKA-O3: Provision for papakāinga development that maintains and enhances health, safety and amenity	Alec Duncan	288.41	Support	For Fire and Emergency, the primary operational requirements for papakāinga development are to ensure they developments are provided with adequate firefighting water supply and access so that Fire and Emergency can respond in a fire or other emergency. This is important to ensure that the health, safety and wellbeing of hapu who occupy papakāinga is provided for and protected.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PKA - Papakainga /Policies /PKA-P4: Servicing of papakāinga developments	Alec Duncan	288.42	Support	Fire and Emergency recognise that papakāinga developments are unique in their purpose, design and layout and often have communal areas that are shared by whanau. In this regard, Fire and Emergency supports the adoption of servicing methods that are suitable for individual site conditions and, where possible, the use of communal infrastructure such as a communal firefighting water supply. The New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 provides this flexibility and Fire and Emergency can support whanau in improving fire safety and creating more resilient papakāinga developments.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
PKA - Papakainga /PKA - Papakainga - Standards Table /PKA-S5: Minimum site size	Alec Duncan	288.43	Amend	To give effect to PKA-O3 and PKA-P4, Fire and Emergency requests an addition sub-standard be added to PKA-S5 requiring space to be allocated for the storage of a firefighting water supply, where applicable. This amendment acknowledges that some papakāinga may be able to connect to the reticulated water supply network however, where no connection or required level of service can be achieved, that sufficient space is provided for the onsite storage of firefighting water supply in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.	Amend as follows: <b>PKA-S5: Minimum site size</b> 1. The minimum site size for a residential building unit will be the sum of the area of land required in a to d f below:... f. <u>Onsite water supply management system (where applicable) – an area of land required to be allocated for the storage of firefighting water supply.</u>	Open Submission
PKA - Papakainga /PKA - Papakainga - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.44	Amend	To give effect to PKA-O3 and PKA-P4, Fire and Emergency requests a new standard be added for papakainga activities. This new standard acknowledges that some papakāinga may be able to connect to the reticulated water supply network however, where no connection or required level of service can be achieved, that sufficient firefighting water supply is provided in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. This standard acknowledges that in many cases, papakāinga developments are not often subdivided and therefore will not be subject to the servicing standards set out in the subdivision chapter. It is therefore important that the land use provision address the serving requirements for papakāinga development.	Add new standard as follows: <b>PKA-S9: Firefighting water supply</b> <u>1. All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u> <u>2. Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided to the development in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u>  <u>Matter of discretion:</u> <u>1. The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u>	Open Submission
PKA - Papakainga /Assessment criteria /PKA-AC1: Buildings accessory to existing or consented residential buildings (PKA-R1); Papakāinga (PKA-R2); Industrial and commercial Buildings and activities associated with papakāinga (PKA-R3); and Papakāinga, buildings accessory to existing or consented residential buildings, and industrial and commercial buildings and activities associated with papakāinga in all other zones not provided for in Rules PKA-R1-PKA-R3 (PKA-R4).	Alec Duncan	288.45	Amend	Fire and Emergency supports the requirements of the papakāinga development plan to the extent that Council must have regard to the location of access(s) and internal roading network. Fire and Emergency understand that papakāinga activities will be subject to the standards set out in TRT. Fire and Emergency also supports the identification or, and avoidance or mitigation from the locational constraints of natural hazards. Fire and Emergency requests amendments to the assessment criteria to reflect the relief sought above.	Amend as follows: <i>Papakāinga development plan</i> When assessing applications, Council will have regard to any 'development plan' prepared for the site which is to detail, but is not limited to detailing, the following: ... x. <u>Location of firefighting water supply in relation to buildings that are present or planned on the site.</u>  <i>Sufficient space to meet servicing needs</i> q. Whether the site layout provides for easy storage and access of recycling and rubbish for collection. r. <u>Whether the site layout provides for emergency service access and wayfinding.</u>  <i>Infrastructure capacity and stormwater management</i> r.s. Whether the development can be sufficiently serviced by water (including firefighting), wastewater, and stormwater infrastructure, including through the use of low impact stormwater design where appropriate.	Open Submission

# HH - Historic Heritage

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HH - Historic heritage /Issues /HH-I4: Archaeology	Wayne Ormsby	63.9	Support	Supports HH-I4 and identifies the potential for Council and the Taiwhenua to work more closely on matters relating to heritage.	No relief sought.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Objectives /HH-O3: Historic heritage streetscapes and groups of buildings and items	Joanne Black	79.2	Amend	Opposes proposed high-density residential zoning in Napier South. Considers that the the character and history of Vigor Brown St should be preserved and protected by making the area of Vigor Brown Street between Carnell Street to Kennedy Road and Kennedy Road to Latham Street, along with Winifred Street, a general residential zone with the addition of a heritage overlay. Considers the significance of homes dating back over 100 years having survived 1931 earthquake. Considers that the building of up to a 19.5 metre apartment style dwelling next to a 100 year old Villa would completely spoil the history and character of the homes in the area. Refers to the report by architect Graham Linwood on Napier's heritage character areas which emphasizes the historic value and character of Napier South's built environment. Consider that there is concern for potential alteration of character due to attractiveness to developers for medium-density housing. Considers that councils proposed zoning disregards this report as there is no difference between the two streets with regards to the historic qualities and style and era of housing.	Amend proposed high density zone for Vigor Brown Street & Winifred Street in Napier South, to be zoned General residential with a historic overlay, like MacDonald Street between Carnell Street and Kennedy Road. Considers that there is no difference in the history or character of the homes in these streets and the council itself commissioned a report in 2019 by registered architect Graham Linwood (Heritage Review) which concluded this.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P1: Identification and classification of historic heritage	Rebecca Eng	99.56	Support	Transpower supports the identification of historic heritage on the basis the mapping and identification will assist with plan interpretation and application.	Retain the policy.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Objectives /HH-O2: Continued use and appreciation	Tom Anderson	151.42	Amend	Supports ongoing use of heritage buildings. Notes that for such buildings to sustain their usefulness, the need to be serviced by modern infrastructure. As such, provision should be made in the Network Utilities chapter allowing for the ongoing use of heritage buildings, given that the Network Utility chapter states there should be a " a single set of rules be provided that apply across the District"	Include the objective in the NU chapter	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies	Tom Anderson	151.43	Amend	Supports and considers that a similar policy should be included in the Network Utility chapter, given that the Network Utility chapter states there should be a " a single set of rules be provided that apply across the District".	Include a similar policy in the NU chapter.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P7: Demolition and relocation	Steve Orme	153.3	Amend	Seeks to amend Policy HH-P7 to provide for demolition of a heritage building where necessary as a result of prohibitive costs faced as a result of required seismic upgrades.	Amend HH-P7 to provide for demolition of a heritage building where necessary as a result of prohibitive costs faced as a result of required seismic upgrades.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /HH-R10: Demolition, including partial demolition, of a Group A heritage item	Steve Orme	153.4	Amend	Amend Rule HH-R10 so that the activity for demolition of a heritage item in circumstances when the cost of seismic strengthening is prohibitive is Controlled or at worst Restricted Discretionary, to be processed and determined without notification. Provide for any necessary consequential changes to the Proposed Plan. See the full submission for more detail.	Amend Rule HH-R10 so that the activity for demolition of a heritage item in circumstances when the cost of seismic strengthening is prohibitive is Controlled or at worst Restricted Discretionary, to be processed and determined without notification. Provide for any necessary consequential changes to the Proposed Plan.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Assessment criteria	Steve Orme	153.5	Amend	Seeks to amend the assessment criteria for the HH chapter so that it provides for the reuse of the heritage fabric of such a building in any replacement structure as one of the assessment criteria that would support the granting of consent for such demolition. See the full submission for more detail.	Amend assessment criteria for HH chapter to provide for the reuse of the heritage fabric of such a building in any replacement structure as one of the assessment criteria that would support the granting of consent for such demolition.	Open Submission

# HH - Historic Heritage

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HH - Historic heritage / /	Di Woods	160.1	Oppose	<p>Waiapu Cathedral has been given notice by Napier City Council that it is an Earthquake Prone building. With earthquake strengthening costs estimated to be at least \$20m, this is outside the financial capacity of the Church or Diocese and future options are now being considered by the Parish and Diocese.</p> <p>This is the third Church to be on this site and the heritage value is in the site rather than the building. Demolition may be a viable option to be considered, but changes in the Proposed Plan are likely to result in an empty building that cannot be used or strengthened (for financial reasons).</p> <p>We want to retain a place for Anglican worship in the city centre. We understand that as a Cathedral, we also have an important civic role. Over the years, we have shown how heritage associated with the expression of our faith can be retained through creative adaptation when the cathedral was rebuilt (and subsequently altered) following the 1931 earthquake and, similarly, through the evolution of the use of Ormond Chapel.</p>	<p>Seeks to make the following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Enable any work to meet legislative requirements addressing matters of human safety (for example: earthquake strengthening works, fire safety) to be undertaken without further restriction.</li> <li>2. Enable internal alterations to be undertaken and changes of use made without further restriction. If any restriction is considered necessary, this should only apply to Ormond Chapel as a Heritage NZ listed building and should relate only to the protection of that identified heritage value in that listing.</li> <li>3. Enable the heritage values to be sustained in the longer term by providing a clear and cost-effective pathway for exterior alterations and demolition/rebuilding to be considered. The proposed plan provisions identify such changes as non-complying, and the policy framework uses 'avoid' wording. This sets a very high threshold and imposes additional costs through consenting to make any change at all.</li> </ol>	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /General /General	Di Woods	160.2	Oppose	<p>We want to retain a place for Anglican worship in the city centre. Over the years, we have shown how heritage associated with the expression of our faith can be retained through creative adaptation through the evolution of the use of Ormond Chapel.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Enable any work to meet legislative requirements addressing matters of human safety (for example: earthquake strengthening works, fire safety) to be undertaken without further restriction.</li> <li>2. Enable internal alterations to be undertaken and changes of use made without further restriction. If any restriction is considered necessary, this should only apply to Ormond Chapel as a Heritage NZ listed building and should relate only to the protection of that identified heritage value in that listing.</li> <li>3. Enable the heritage values to be sustained in the longer term by providing a clear and cost-effective pathway for exterior alterations and demolition/rebuilding to be considered. The proposed plan provisions identify such changes as non-complying, and the policy framework uses 'avoid' wording. This sets a very high threshold and imposes additional costs through consenting to make any change at all.</li> </ol>	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Objectives /HH-O2: Continued use and appreciation	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.44	Support	Powerco supports this policy and the clarity which it provides.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P3: Continued use	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.45	Support	Powerco supports this policy and the clarity which it provides.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission

# HH - Historic Heritage

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.46	Amend	Powerco seeks additional rules specific to network utilities, to ensure the the ability for existing network utilities to be maintained or upgraded, as well as the addition of new network utilities to be provided for. These new rules could sit in the Historic Heritage rules or the Network Utility rules (with suitable cross-referencing). Utilities play an important part of the continued use or adaptive reuse of heritage items, which is supported by Objective HH-O2 and Policy HH-P3.	<p>Add new rules:</p> <p><u>HH-Rxx: Maintenance and minor upgrades of existing network utilities located on or within Group A or Group B heritage items.</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status: Permitted</u></p> <p><u>HH-Rxx: The addition of new network utilities located on Group A or Group B heritage items.</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status: Controlled</u></p> <p><u>Matters of control are restricted to:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>1. Streetscape values;</u></li> <li><u>2. Effects on heritage values;</u></li> <li><u>3. Visual effects;</u></li> <li><u>4. Adaptive reuse, and</u></li> <li><u>5. Cumulative effects.</u></li> </ol>	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P3: Continued use	Tania Diack	191.2	Amend	Policy HH-P3 addresses demolition and partial demolition of scheduled heritage sites. The current policy enables consideration of “serious and immediate threat to property, people or services”. However, there is no consideration of demolition to mitigate the high risk of natural hazards over the medium-long term, for example the application of Category 3 to land where there is serious risk to life from future flood events. This should be a relevant consideration in assessment of resource consents to demolish heritage buildings in these areas.	Amend the wording of Policy HH-P3 to enable consideration of longer term as well as immediate serious threats from natural hazards.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Assessment criteria /HH-AC6: Demolition of a Group B heritage item	Tania Diack	191.3	Amend	Assessment criteria HH-AC6 addresses demolition and partial demolition of Group B scheduled heritage sites. The current criteria enables consideration of whether the heritage item in its current state poses a safety risk, including loss of life, in the event of an earthquake. However, there is no consideration of potential safety issues from buildings and property from other natural hazards, such as high intensity rainfall events. For example, occupation and use of heritage scheduled residential buildings within Category 3 would cause serious risk to life from future flood events. This should be a relevant consideration in assessment of resource consents to demolish heritage buildings in these areas.	Amend the wording of Assessment criteria HH-AC6 to enable consideration of the effects from all natural hazards, not just earthquakes as currently drafted.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.42	Amend	Consistent with Policy HH-P3, Council wishes to enable continued use on buildings for modern activities, including encouraging the use of solar panels, on heritage items provided that heritage values are not compromised.	<p>Add new permitted activity rule (for both contributory and non-contributory sites):</p> <p>Minor external alterations to any Group A or Group B heritage item that are associated with:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Security alarms</li> <li>ii) Security lighting</li> <li>iii) Any attachment that is not visible from a road or public space, excluding signage</li> </ol>	Open Submission

# HH - Historic Heritage

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /General	Sue and Howard Dick and Pilgrim	261.1	Oppose	Seeks to delete Item 198 from Schedule 3 of the PDP for the following reasons:  - there is no benefit to the owners and will make maintenance more costly and difficult - ratepayers should contribute to the cost of retention and maintenance of the buildings if there is a benefit to them of the buildings retention None of the buildings have been demolished in over 140 years. With the majority of homes now with an owner-occupier status, those owning the homes retain them because they value their heritage status - A heritage status may make the homes difficult to sell Initially attracted to the policy that prevented demolition, however now consider there is no need for this given each of the properties value and size, and the lack of evidence of a developer looking to purchase multiple properties making the risk of demolition and redevelopment low	We seek removal of Schedule 3 item 198 from the Napier City Proposed District Plan	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Introduction	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.27	Support	Supports Historical and Cultural Values / HH - Historic Heritage Introduction and in particular supports the three aims (a - c) that historic heritage provisions seek to achieve.	Retain Historical and Cultural Values / HH - Historic Heritage Introduction as notified.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Issues /General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.28	Support	Supports HH - Historic Heritage Issues as HNZPT considers these are the key historic heritage issues in the Napier region; in particular HNZPT supports the statement at HH-14: Archaeology may be lost through the development / redevelopment of sites and through land use activities, which is a useful summary of archaeology as a resource issue in New Zealand.	Retain HH - Historic Heritage Issues Section as notified.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Objectives /HH-O1: Historic heritage preservation	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.29	Support	Supports Objective HH-O1: Historic heritage preservation.	Retain Objective HH-O1: Historic heritage preservation.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Objectives /HH-O2: Continued use and appreciation	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.30	Support	Supports HH-O2: Continued use and appreciation.	Retain HH-O2: Continued use and appreciation.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Objectives /HH-O3: Historic heritage streetscapes and groups of buildings and items	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.31	Support	HNZPT supports HH-O3: Historic heritage streetscapes and groups of buildings and items however, the 'streetscapes and groups' should be more clearly linked with the Precincts and Overlays identified in Schedule 4.	Retain Objective HH-O3: Historic heritage streetscapes and groups of buildings and items with the following minor amendment:  The historic heritage values of <del>the identified streetscapes and groups</del> <u>overlays and precincts identified in Schedule 4</u> , including the contribution...	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Objectives /HH-O4: Archaeological sites	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.32	Support	Supports Objective HH-O4: Archaeological sites as it proposes identification.	Retain Objective HH-O4: Archaeological sites as notified.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P1: Identification and classification of historic heritage	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.33	Support	Supports Policy HH-P1: Identification and classification of historic heritage as HNZPT supports the list of qualities identified in this Policy.	Retain Policy HH-P1: Identification and classification of historic heritage in its entirety.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P2: Protection and maintenance of heritage values	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.34	Support	The submitter supports Policy HH-P2: Protection and maintenance of heritage values as it refers to the protection and maintenance of heritage values.	Retain Policy HH-P2: Protection and maintenance of heritage values as notified.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P3: Continued use	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.35	Support	Supports HH-P3: Continued use Policy with its reference for continued and alternative uses, where the activity does not compromise heritage values.	Retain HH-P3: Continued use as notified.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P5: Streetscapes and groups	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.36	Amend	Considers that HH-P5: Streetscapes and groups should be amended as the 'streetscapes and groups' should be more clearly linked with the Precincts and Overlays identified in Schedule 4.	Amend HH-P5: Streetscapes and groups as follows:  Retain the character and integrity of historic streetscapes and groups of buildings and items <u>(as identified in the overlays and precincts identified in Schedule 4), by ...</u>	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P6: Safety improvements	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.37	Amend	Supports Policy HH-P6: Safety improvements that provide for safety alterations, without compromising heritage values.	Retain Policy HH-P6: Safety improvements in its entirety.	Open Submission



# HH - Historic Heritage

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P7: Demolition and relocation	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.38	Oppose	Opposes Policy HH-P7: Demolition and relocation as the term significant public benefit is not defined in the PDP, and it is ambiguous and is open for interpretation. A number of new developments could potentially argue "significant public benefit" from an increase in housing or commercial floorspace supply. The policy mentions exploring alternatives but does not say that an application has to show that retention is not feasible, but that it has merely considered/explored other options. Reference to 'taking into account possible future technology advances' in clause 4 is considered problematic. It is ambiguous as to what may or may not be possible in the future.	Amend Policy HH-P7: Demolition and relocation as follows: Avoid total or partial demolition or relocation of historic heritage items and elements of significant heritage values unless: <del>1. The demolition or relocation is required to allow for significant public benefit:</del> <del>a. that could not otherwise be achieved, and</del> <del>b. where the significant public benefit outweighs the retention of the historic heritage item or parts of the heritage item; and/or</del> 2. The partial demolition is necessary.... 3. It is necessary to prevent serious ... <del>4. for clauses 1, 2 and 3 above, all other reasonable alternatives to retain the heritage item have been explored, taking into account possible future technological advances; and ... There are no reasonable alternatives to relocation, partial demolition, or total demolition; and</del> 5. An archaeological authority ...	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P8: Identification and management of archaeological sites	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.39	Support	Supports Policy HH-P8: Identification and management of archaeological sites but considers an amendment is necessary as there is a typo whereby the hyperlink to the definition of 'site' needs to be amended, and instead link to a (new) definition of 'archaeological site'.	Retain Policy HH-P8: Identification and management of archaeological sites but amend the hyperlink.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P9: Non-regulatory incentives	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.40	Amend	Considers HH-P9: Non-regulatory incentives is supported subject to an amendment to the hyperlink definition of 'site' that instead links to a (new) definition of 'archaeological site'.	Retain Policy HH-P9: Non-regulatory incentives with an amendment to the hyperlink to a (new) definition of 'archaeological site'.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P9: Non-regulatory incentives	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.41	Support	The submitter supports HH - Historic Heritage - Policy HH-P9: Non-regulatory incentives as a policy which encourages the use of non-regulatory incentives is supported.	Retain HH - Historic Heritage - Policy HH-P9: Non-regulatory incentives as notified.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /HH-R1: Maintenance and repair to the interior and/or exterior of a Group A or Group B heritage item; internal alterations, and/or internal safety alterations to a Group B heritage item	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.42	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule HH-R1: Maintenance and repair to the interior and/or exterior of a Group A or Group B heritage item; internal alterations, and/or internal safety alterations to a Group B heritage item as the range of works covered should be split up into multiple rules for improved clarity and readability. A permitted activity status for maintenance and repair (interior or exterior) of Group 1 and 2 heritage items is supported. A requirement to cause 'no damage' to the heritage item is potentially overly strict. No permanent damage would be a more reasonable standard.	Amend HH-R1: maintenance and repair to the interior and/or exterior of a Group A or Group B heritage item; internal alterations, and/or internal safety alterations to a Group B heritage item as follows:  HH-R1: Maintenance and Repair to the interior and/or exterior of a Group A or Group B heritage item. ; <del>internal alterations, and/or internal safety alterations to a Group B heritage item</del> <del>Where the following activity conditions are met:</del> 1. Any materials removed to carry out the repairs must be limited to the amount necessary to carry out the works. 2. There must be no <u>permanent</u> damage to the heritage item. when undertaking the repairs and maintenance, and protective material must be used when necessary to prevent damage. HH-R1B <u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u>  1. The extent of loss of heritage fabric and the extent of adverse effects on heritage values, including damage arising from scaffolding damage, and 2. The contents of any conservation plan for the heritage item. New Rule for alterations: HH-RX Internal alterations and internal safety alterations to Group B heritage items Activity Status: Permitted Where the following activity conditions are met: 1. Internal alterations do not result in new internal walls or floor levels visible from the exterior of the	Open Submission

# HH - Historic Heritage

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /HH-R3: External safety alterations to a Group B heritage item	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.43	Amend	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) considers Rule HH-R3: External safety alterations to a Group B heritage item should be amended as while it supports the need for a structural engineering assessment to be included in a resource consent for this work, concern is raised [about] the wording of the note.	Amend Rule HH-R3: External safety alterations to a Group B heritage item as follows: Note: <del>An application under this rule must be accompanied by: A structural engineering assessment by a chartered professional engineer must accompany the application. Where this is not supplied, work will be assessed as an 'alteration' as it fails to meet the definition of 'safety alteration'.</del>	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /HH-R4: Internal or external safety alterations to a Group A heritage item	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.44	Support	Considers HH-R4: Internal or external safety alterations to a Group A heritage item as the Restricted Activity Status and matters of discretion for this activity are supported. However, to be consistent with HH-R3, a note should be added about need for a structural engineering assessment.	Retain HH-R4: Internal or external safety alterations to a Group A heritage item with an amendment as follows:  <u>Note: An application under this rule must be accompanied by a structural engineering assessment by a chartered professional engineer.</u>	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /HH-R5: External alterations (excluding safety alterations) and/or additions to any Group B heritage item	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.45	Oppose	Opposes HH-R5: External alterations (excluding safety alterations) and/or additions to any Group B heritage item as considers the Definition of 'Alteration or Addition' needs to be amended as a very broad definition for alteration is proposed, which potentially extends far beyond the common word usage of the word 'alteration'. Provisions which potentially disguise a significant volume of 'partial demolition' under a more oblique term, could potentially encourage demolition in stages.	Retain HH-R5: External alterations (excluding safety alterations) and/or additions to any Group B heritage item.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /HH-R6: Internal or external alterations (excluding safety alterations) to a Group A heritage item	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.46	Support	Supports HH-R6: Internal or external alterations (excluding safety alterations) to a Group A heritage item as the activity status for this type of work is supported.	Retain HH-R6: Internal or external alterations (excluding safety alterations) to a Group A heritage item as notified.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /HH-R8: Demolition, including partial demolition, of a Group B heritage item	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.47	Amend	The submitter supports Rule HH-R8: Demolition, including partial demolition, of a Group B heritage item with regards to the activity status for the demolition and partial demolition of Group 1 and 2 Heritage items. It is noted that the current definition of partial demolition, excludes the demolition of up to 30% of the heritage building regardless of location or condition. It is considered that the definition of partial demolition should be amended, so that for example the demolition of building facades is assessed under Rules HH-R8 and HH-R10.	Retain Rule HH-R8: Demolition, including partial demolition, of a Group B heritage item.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /HH-R10: Demolition, including partial demolition, of a Group A heritage item	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.48	Amend	Considers Rule HH-R10: Demolition, including partial demolition, of a Group A heritage item while supported should be amended regarding the definition of partial demolition, so that for example the demolition of building facades is assessed under Rules HH-R8 and HH-R10.	Retain Rule HH-R10: Demolition, including partial demolition, of a Group A heritage item.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /HH-R11: Activities not otherwise provided for	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.49	Amend	The submitter supports Rule HH-R11: Activities not otherwise provided for with regards to the activity status for the demolition and partial demolition of Group 1 and 2 Heritage items. It is noted that the current definition of partial demolition, excludes the demolition of up to 30% of the heritage building regardless of location or condition. It is considered that the definition of partial demolition should be amended, so that for example the demolition of building facades is assessed under Rules HH-R8 and HH-R10.	Retain Rule HH-R11: Activities not otherwise provided for.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /HH-R7: Relocation of a Group B heritage item within or beyond the property boundaries	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.50	Support	Supports Rule HH-R7: Relocation of a Group B heritage item within or beyond the property boundaries as HNZPT supports these rules controlling relocation of heritage items.	Retain Rule HH-R7: Relocation of a Group B heritage item within or beyond the property boundaries as notified.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /HH-R9: Relocation of a Group A heritage item within or beyond the property boundaries Activity Status: Non-complying NA	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.51	Support	Supports HH-R9: Relocation of a Group A heritage item within or beyond the property boundaries as HNZPT supports these rules controlling relocation of heritage items.	Retain Rule HH-R9: Relocation of a Group A heritage item within or beyond the property boundaries as notified.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.52	Oppose	Opposes HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table as sites containing heritage buildings can often contain accessory buildings such as storage sheds and garages. It is important to manage the location and appearance of new buildings, to ensure they do not adversely affect the setting of scheduled heritage items. Small accessory buildings, appropriately located, should be able to be established as a permitted activity, while there should be a consenting pathway for other buildings, allowing the effects on heritage values to be considered.	<p>Seeks to amend HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table with a new Rule as follows:</p> <p>HH-XX: New buildings and structures on sites containing Group A or B heritage items. Activity status: Permitted Where the following activity conditions are met:</p> <p>A new building is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Accessory to an existing residential unit;</li> <li>2. Located behind the front façade of the primary building</li> <li>3. Is physically detached from the primary building</li> <li>4. Construction works have no direct or indirect effect on the primary building</li> <li>5. the building has a floor area of no more than 10m2 and a height less than 3m.</li> </ol> <p>Activity status where activity conditions are not met: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. compatibility with the scale, form, proportion, design and materials of the heritage building or heritage structure;</li> <li>2. Effect on relationship of the heritage building or heritage structure with its setting;</li> <li>3. any temporary construction effects</li> <li>4. Streetscape values</li> <li>5. Visual effects</li> <li>6. Cumulative effects</li> </ol>	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Assessment criteria /HH-AC1: Maintenance and repair and internal alterations and/or internal safety alterations to a Group B heritage item	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.53	Amend	Considers that to be consistent with the HNZPT submission point on HH-R1, separate HH-AC1 into two sections. As the Napier Art Deco Design Guide may not be relevant to all heritage items, the Council may wish to add the words 'where applicable' to clause d. Regarding point (e) – conservation plans – the phrasing of this clause could be clearer, and refer to the extent to which the work is consistent with the contents of any conservation plan for the building or structure. With regards to internal safety and other alterations, the assessment criteria should refer to the extent to which the internal alterations or safety alterations result in changes to interior walls or floors which are visible from the exterior of the building, and the extent to which the alterations adversely impact on the heritage values of the place.	<p>Amend HH-AC1 as follows:</p> <p>d. the extent to which the work is being undertaken in a manner consistent with the Napier Art Deco Design Guide, <u>where applicable.</u></p> <p>e. <del>Whether a conservation plan prepared by a suitably qualified heritage professional has been prepared to inform the work being undertaken (where appropriate).</del> <u>The extent to which the work is consistent with the contents of any conservation plan for the building or structure (where applicable).</u></p> <p>f. <u>The extent to which the internal alterations or safety alterations result in changes to interior walls or floors which are visible from the exterior of the building, and the extent to which the alterations adversely impact on the heritage values of the place.</u></p>	Open Submission

# HH - Historic Heritage

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HH - Historic heritage /Assessment criteria /HH-AC3: External safety alterations to a Group B heritage item HH-R3; External or internal safety alterations to a Group A heritage item	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.54	Amend	The submitter considers HH-AC3: External safety alterations to a Group B heritage item HH-R3; External or internal safety alterations to a Group A heritage item HH-R4 should be amended as whilst the intent of the assessment criteria is supported, HNZPT recommends several amendments to improve the meaning of the criteria, and to delete unnecessary repetition.Clause d reads as an explanatory note and not a assessment criteria. Under clause e, it would be preferable to also refer to significant external features Clauses f, j and m are a repeat of clause b.Amendments to clauses n and q have also been suggested, to aid in clarity and meaning.	Amend HH-AC3: External safety alterations to a Group B heritage item HH-R3; External or internal safety alterations to a Group A heritage item HH-R4 as follows:  <u>Advice Note:</u> <del>d.</del> The extent of the alterations and the relative significance of the heritage item will determine the scale of heritage assessment required, or whether a conservation plan is preferred prior to the work being carried out. <del>e.</del> The extent to which significant original interior finishes <u>and external features</u> will be retained <del>f.</del> <u>The extent to which the work is being undertaken in a manner consistent with the Napier Art Deco Design Guide.</u> <del>j.</del> <u>The extent to which the work is being undertaken in a manner consistent with the Napier Art Deco Design Guide.</u> <del>m.</del> <u>The extent to which the work is being undertaken in a manner consistent with the Napier Art Deco Design Guide.</u> <del>n.</del> <u>Recommendations contained in a Whether the building has been subject to a detailed structural engineering assessment by a chartered professional engineer. This should.....alterations.</u> <del>q.</del> <u>The extent to which the work enables the continuation of the existing use, previous use or alternative use of the heritage item; compatible, original, and new adaptive uses.</u>	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Assessment criteria /HH-AC4: Internal or external alteration (excluding safety alterations) to a Group A heritage item HH-R6; External alterations (excluding safety alterations) to a Group B heritage item HH-R5	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.55	Support	Supports HH-AC4: Internal or external alteration (excluding safety alterations) to a Group A heritage item HH-R6; External alterations (excluding safety alterations) to a Group B heritage item HH-R5 as assessment criteria contain a variety of relevant matters covering both potentially adverse and positive effects.	Retain HH-AC4: Internal or external alteration (excluding safety alterations) to a Group A heritage item HH-R6; External alterations (excluding safety alterations) to a Group B heritage item HH-R5 as notified.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Assessment criteria /HH-AC5: Relocation of a Group B heritage item HH-R7	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.56	Amend	The submitter considers HH-AC5: Relocation of a Group B heritage item HH-R7 should be amended as assessment criteria which focuses on the need for relocation are supported. [However] it is noted that a number of assessment criteria do not read as criteria but policy or notes. Alternative wording is suggested to put points in a criteria framework.	Amend HH-AC5: Relocation of a Group B heritage item HH-R7 as follows: i. Any genuine threat to the heritage item that prevents retention of the heritage item in its current location <del>which should be documented.</del> ii. <del>Whether</del> the new location should allows an und erstanding of the remaining significance of the heritage item ... iii. <del>Whether relocation enables</del> future preservation of the heritage item <del>will be</del> provided through a compatible use, improved physical condition, appropriate context or surroundings, and protection from vandalism and fire. iv. <del>Whether</del> a heritage item was designed to be relocatable or relocation has been a feature of its history, <del>relocation may in some circumstances be appropriate. However, a full assessment of the potential effects of relocation should, nevertheless, be carried out.</del> v. <del>Whether R</del> relocation <u>affects the relationship of the heritage item with a wider group of historic buildings and structures. Should be informed by the concept of greater or total conservation benefit with respect to a large complex group of structures and buildings. It may be that the removal of minor structures may be justified to achieve the conservation of the most significant places on the entire site.</u> vi. <del>What All other alternatives should be assessed before to relocation is were considered (e.g. funding sources) and all decisions must be informed by a heritage assessment or conservation plan, where one exists, and archaeological advice.</del>	Open Submission

# HH - Historic Heritage

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HH - Historic heritage /Assessment criteria /HH-AC6: Demolition of a Group B heritage item HH-R8	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.57	Support	Supports HH-AC6: Demolition of a Group B heritage item HH-R8 as assessment criteria are considered appropriate. It is noted that assessment criteria are equally relevant to the demolition/partial demolition of Group 1 heritage items.	Retain HH-AC6: Demolition of a Group B heritage item HH-R8 as notified.	Open Submission

# TREE - Notable Trees

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TREE - Notable Trees /TREE - Notable Trees - Rules Table /Activity Status: Discretionary	Tom Anderson	151.46	Oppose	Opposes as Network utility operators often work in tree driplines, and generally follow the process outlined in TREE-R1. As the trimming and pruning occurs as per TREE-R1, a blanket requirement for network utility operators to require resource consent in the dripline of notable tree's is unnecessary. A permitted rule should be provided in the NU chapter.	Delete TREE-R5 and rely on the other rules which apply to works within the dripline of notable trees, with the rules being located in the NU chapter.	Open Submission
TREE - Notable Trees /TREE - Notable Trees - Rules Table /TREE-R6: Any earthworks within the dripline of a notable tree	Tom Anderson	151.47	Amend	Considers that there are known and accepted methods for earthworks in the dripline of notable trees, and these should be included as permitted activities in the rule. The rule should be located in the NU Chapter.	Add permitted provision for earthworks in the dripline of notable trees into a new rule in the NU Chapter, with the permitted thresholds being the following:  <u>earthworks for the purpose of installing underground network utilities, including customer connections, provided these are:</u> i. no shallower than 1m below ground level; ii. installed by hand-digging or trenchless means (such as air spade, hydro vac or directional drilling methods); and iii. have an entry point either outside of the root protection area or that has an area of less than 1m2;	Open Submission
TREE - Notable Trees /TREE - Notable Trees - Rules Table /TREE-R1: Trimming, pruning, and treatment of a notable tree/TREE-R1A	Sheena McGuire	168.62	Support	Notes that there is a grouping of notable trees within the rail corridor along Awatoto Road in the Operative Plan. These trees are identified as notable trees within the Proposed Plan (ref. 4). Supports trimming, pruning, and treatment of a notable tree as a Permitted Activity subject to conditions. Also supports the matters of discretion which include serious hazard/damage and nuisances.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
TREE - Notable Trees /TREE - Notable Trees - Rules Table /TREE-R2: Removal or destruction of a notable tree/TREE-R2A	Sheena McGuire	168.63	Amend	Seeks amendment to this provision to provide for the removal of a notable tree if it has the potential to create severe adverse effects on the safe and efficient operation of a network utility. This would allow submitter to remove a notable tree if it was likely to create a hazard threatening the safe operation of the rail network.	Amend as follows:  TREE-R2A Activity Status: Permitted Where: 1. The tree is either dead, has a fatal disease, or has the potential to create severe adverse effects on the health and safety of people; 2. <u>The tree has the potential to create severe adverse effects on the safe and efficient operation of a network utility;</u> 3. It is undertaken by the Council and approved by the Chief Executive Officer, and 4. It is consistent with section 5.6 of the City Wide Reserve Management Plan.	Open Submission
TREE - Notable Trees /TREE - Notable Trees - Rules Table /TREE-R5: Any network utility operations within the dripline of a notable tree/Activity Status: Discretionary	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.47	Oppose	There may be instances where existing network utilities are located within the dripline of notable trees. The ability to access these utilities for maintenance or repairs is critical. It is considered that subject to appropriate conditions, such works can occur as a permitted activity.	Amend as follows:  <b>TREE-R5: Any <u>underground</u> network utility operations within the dripline of a notable tree</b> <b>Activity Status: <del>Discretionary</del> Permitted</b> <b>Where:</b> <u>1. Any soil disturbance is undertaken via the use of an airspade, hydrovac or handtools.</u> <u>2. New works are installed using trenchless installation methods.</u> <u>3. The works are undertaken or supervised by the Council or a qualified arborist.</u> <del>NA</del> <b>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: Discretionary</b> <b>Notification:</b> Any application under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified.	Open Submission
TREE - Notable Trees /TREE - Notable Trees - Rules Table /TREE-R2: Removal or destruction of a notable tree/TREE-R2A	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.38	Amend	The City Wide Reserve Management Plan is going to be replaced by a new proposed plan in 2024 therefore this reference will be out of date by the time the PDP is made operative.	Delete reference to the City Wide Reserve Management Plan.	Open Submission
TREE - Notable Trees /Policies /TREE-P1: Identification of notable trees	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.58	Support	Supports Policy TREE-P1: Identification of notable trees as HNZPT supports the inclusion of historical importance as one aspect of determining the significance of trees.	Retain Policy TREE-P1: Identification of notable trees as notified.	Open Submission

# TREE - Notable Trees

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TREE - Notable Trees /Assessment criteria /TREE-AC2: Removal or destruction (TREE-R2)Tree condition	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.59	Support	Supports TREE-AC2: Removal or destruction (TREE-R2) as the assessment criteria are appropriate for significant notable trees, in particular it is appropriate to include the reference to archaeology in clause h.	Retain TREE-AC2: Removal or destruction (TREE-R2) as notified.	Open Submission
TREE - Notable Trees /Introduction /	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.72	Amend	Considers that notable trees, whether indigenous or exotic, may be significant habitat for native species. This should be mentioned in the introduction.The identification and protection of notable trees should not be limited to those in public ownership. While the plan provisions cannot create a positive obligation on private landowners to maintain their trees, the plan can at least ensure that notable trees are not adversely affected by inappropriate trimming and removal.	Seeks to amend as follows: “The purpose of the Notable Trees chapter is to provide for the identification and protection of trees within Napier that are of significance for their historical, social, cultural, botanical, amenity, and/or landmark values.  <u>Some notable trees or groups of trees with significant values may also provide habitat for significant indigenous fauna.</u> Trees of outstanding...” Delete the paragraph commencing: “The identification of...”.	Open Submission
TREE - Notable Trees /Introduction /	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.72	Amend	Considers that notable trees, whether indigenous or exotic, may be significant habitat for native species. This should be mentioned in the introduction.The identification and protection of notable trees should not be limited to those in public ownership. While the plan provisions cannot create a positive obligation on private landowners to maintain their trees, the plan can at least ensure that notable trees are not adversely affected by inappropriate trimming and removal.	Seeks to amend as follows: “The purpose of the Notable Trees chapter is to provide for the identification and protection of trees within Napier that are of significance for their historical, social, cultural, botanical, amenity, and/or landmark values.  <u>Some notable trees or groups of trees with significant values may also provide habitat for significant indigenous fauna.</u> Trees of outstanding...” Delete the paragraph commencing: “The identification of...”.	Open Submission
TREE - Notable Trees /Issues /TREE-I1: Identification and protection of notable trees	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.73	Amend	Considers that the issue should not be restricted to trees on Council- owned land. Trees in private ownership can be as important as those on public land.	Amend as follows: There is a risk or removal or damage to notable tree <del>on council-owned land</del> with people.... Delete the paragraph commencing “Due to the sheer scale” and replace with a paragraph recognising the importance of maintaining and protecting notable trees on Council-owned land, and ensuring that adverse effects on privately owned trees are avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Open Submission
TREE - Notable Trees /Objectives /TREE-O1: Identification and protection of notable trees	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.74	Amend	Considers that the objective should also capture the importance of trees to foster local biodiversity, habitat and connectivity.The identification and protection of notable trees should not be limited to those in public ownership.	Amend as follows: Trees (individual or groups) in public <u>or private</u> ownership that significantly contribute to the city’s character, history, amenity, <del>and</del> identity or are of botanical significance <u>or of importance to indigenous biodiversity</u> are identified and protected.	Open Submission
TREE - Notable Trees /Policies /TREE-P1: Identification of notable trees	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.75	Amend	Considers that some notable trees and groups of trees with significant value may provide habitat for significant indigenous fauna. This policy should recognise that.It should also apply to trees in private ownership.	Amend as follows: “Identify, map, and schedule notable trees in public <u>and private</u> ownership that significantly contribute to the city’s character, history, amenity, and identity or are of botanical significance <u>or of importance to indigenous biodiversity</u> . Trees will be evaluated using Standard Tree Evaluation Method (STEM), with those achieving the following benchmarks being scheduled as notable:- a minimum STEM value of 180;- a minimum of 50 years old, and be significant for at least one of the following reasons: historical importance, botanical rarity, importance as a significant landscape feature, size, age, form, and condition or function value <u>(e.g. key habitat for indigenous fauna)</u> ”	Open Submission

## TREE - Notable Trees

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TREE - Notable Trees /General /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.76	Oppose	Opposes the whole chapter, including Introduction, Objectives, Policies and Rules Arising from late notification of ECO-chapter	Seeks to add: <u>"The Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter includes provisions which relate to notable trees. Where there is a conflict between the Notable Trees chapter and the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter, the provisions that place greater or additional restrictions on activities with adverse effects on natural environments will apply"</u> .	Open Submission
TREE - Notable Trees /TREE - Notable Trees - Rules Table /TREE-R1: Trimming, pruning, and treatment of a notable tree	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.77	Oppose	Considers that the Rule needs to be amended to provide for work to be undertaken by a suitably qualified and/or experienced arborist, where not on Council land.	Seeks to amend 3 to provide for work to be undertaken by a suitably qualified and/or experienced arborist, where not on Council land.	Open Submission
TREE - Notable Trees /TREE - Notable Trees - Rules Table /TREE-R2: Removal or destruction of a notable tree	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.78	Oppose	Considers that the Rule needs to consider bird breeding season and ensure removal or destruction to be conducted outside of those periods.	Seeks to amend the permitted activity standard so that activities won't be conducted during roosting periods. Amend 3. for work to be undertaken by a suitably qualified and/or experienced arborist, where not on Council land.	Open Submission



# SOSM - Sites of Significance to Māori

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SOSM - Sites of Significance to Maori /SOSM - Sites of Significance to Maori /	Rebecca Eng	99.57	Support	Transpower supports a variation to the PDP in relation to Sites of Significance to Māori. Transpower notes the submission points made in the balance of this submission have been made without the benefit of the Sites of Significance to Māori provisions and therefore Transpower reserves its position on the lodged submission points in so far as they relate to Sites of Significance to Māori.	Seeks to ensure submitters have the ability to update other submission points in so far as they are relevant to SOSM - Sites of Significance to Māori.	Open Submission
SOSM - Sites of Significance to Maori /SOSM - Sites of Significance to Maori /	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere	273.60	Support	HNZPT supports SOSM - Sites of Significance to Māori as it notes that preparation of the SOSM provisions has been affected by Cyclone Gabrielle, and that these provisions will be released as a variation to the PDP. HNZPT looks forward to engaging in this process.	Retain 'placeholder' SOSM - Sites of Significance to Māori Chapter.	Open Submission

# OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay - Standards Table /OVR1-S5: Fences and walls	Susan Dallas	25.6	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay - Standards Table /OVR1-S5: Fences and walls	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.6	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table	Tom Anderson	151.48	Support	Considers that it needs to be confirmed that due to the presence of this provision, that the customer connection to heritage buildings or items as sought in this submission applies to this heritage overlay.	Seeks confirmation that due to the presence of this provision, that the customer connection to heritage buildings or items as sought in this submission applies to this heritage overlay.	Open Submission
OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.43	Amend	Council wishes to enable continued use, including solar panels, on heritage items provided that heritage values are not compromised.	Add new permitted activity rule (for both contributory and non-contributory sites):  Minor external alterations to any Group A or Group B heritage item that are associated with: i) Security alarms ii) Security lighting iii) Any attachment that is not visible from a road or public space, excluding signage	Open Submission
OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR1-R6: New or relocated buildings or structures on a Contributory site, not otherwise provided for by OVR1-R2OVR1-R6A	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.81	Amend	The current matters of discretion only refer to historic heritage attributes, however the broader built and streetscape heritage character attributes are also identified in Schedule 4 and are likely relevant to consideration of the design of new dwellings. This also applies in the other historic heritage character overlays.	Suggest amending the matters of discretion for OVR1_R6A as follows:  - Consistency and compatibility with historic heritage <u>attributes and values and built and streetscape heritage character attributes</u> identified in the SCHED4 Historic Heritage Overlay and Precinct Schedule - Same change recommended to all similar provisions throughout the heritage overlays.	Open Submission
OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay /Objectives /OVR1-O2: Protect and maintain heritage values	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.62	Support	Supports Objective OVR1-O2: Protect and maintain heritage values as the objective with its reference to protection and maintenance of historic heritage values of each area is supported.	Retain Objective OVR1-O2: Protect and maintain heritage values as notified.	Open Submission
OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR1-P2: Cumulative adverse effects	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.70	Support	Supports OVR1-P2: Cumulative adverse effects as the reference to avoiding cumulative effects to the historic heritage values of Overlay areas is supported.	Retain OVR1-P2: Cumulative adverse effects as notified.	Open Submission
OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR1-P3: New buildings and structures	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.78	Support	Supports OVR1-P3: New buildings and structures as the intent of the policy is supported, with its reference to ensuring that new buildings are sympathetic with existing heritage values.	Retain OVR1-P3: New buildings and structures as notified.	Open Submission
OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR1-P4: Alterations, additions, and partial demolition	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.79	Support	Supports OVR1-P4 as the intention of the policy is supported.	Retain OVR1-P4: Alterations, additions, and partial demolition as notified.	Open Submission
OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR1-P6: Total demolition and removal on Non-contributory sites	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.80	Support	Considers that these policies (OVR1-P6 OVR2-P5 OVR3-P5 OVR5-P5 OVR6-P5 OVR7-P5 OVR8-P6) are supported as being appropriate for non-contributory sites. The associated rule for this policy uses the term relocation rather than removal. It is preferable to use consistent terms through an amendment.	Amend Policies OVR1-P6 OVR2-P5 OVR3-P5 OVR5-P5 OVR6-P5 OVR7-P5 OVR8-P6 as follows:  Total demolition and <del>Removal</del> <u>relocation</u> of buildings and structures on Non-contributory sites	Open Submission
OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR1-P7: Total demolition and removal on Contributory sites	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.82	Support	Supports the use of the term 'Avoid' as well as the consideration of alternatives for Policies OVR1-P7 OVR2-P6 OVR3-P6 OVR4-P6 OVR5-P6 OVR6-P6 OVR7-P6 OVR8-P7.	Retain Policies OVR1-P7 OVR2-P6 OVR3-P6 OVR4-P6 OVR5-P6 OVR6-P6 OVR7-P6 OVR8-P7 pertaining to demolition of buildings on contributory sites.	Open Submission
OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR-R1: Maintenance and repair of any existing building or structure on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.83	Support	HNZPT supports the Permitted activity rule for maintenance and repair.(OVR1 to OVR8 inclusive)	Retain Maintenance and repair Rules as notified.	Open Submission
OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR1-R2: Ancillary buildings and structures, not including fences and walls, on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.84	Amend	HNZPT considers that while R2 Overlays Rules for Ancillary / accessory buildings and structures, not including fences and walls, on a Contributory site (Overlays 1 to 7 inclusive) are supported, there is however inconsistency in OVR1-R2 over its use of the word 'Ancillary' versus 'Accessory' for the other Overlays. Accessory building is preferred, as it is a Defined term in the Plan.	Amend Rule OVR1-R2 by replacing the word <del>ancillary</del> with <u>accessory</u> .	Open Submission

# OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR1-R4: External alterations, additions, total or partial demolition, or relocation to an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.85	Oppose	Opposes Rule OVR1-R4: External alterations, additions, total or partial demolition, or relocation to an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site wording as a lower level of control on the construction of new accessory buildings and alterations to existing accessory buildings is appropriate. It is noted that the proposed Rule 4 allows for the total demolition of accessory buildings as a permitted activity. Rules regarding demolition of accessory buildings (Rule 4) appears to conflict with rules regarding total demolition 'of any building or structure' (Rule 8) on Contributing sites in some overlay areas. This conflict is apparent comparing Rules 4 and 8 in Overlays 2, 4, and 7.	Retain Rules pertaining to accessory buildings on contributory sites.	Open Submission
OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR1-R5: External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.92	Support	Supports OVR1-R5: External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site. However, Rule OVR3-R5 refers to 'accessory buildings' and is essentially a repeat of OVR3-R4 necessitating an amendment.	Retain OVR1-R5, with the exception of OVR3-R5 to be amended as follows:  External additions, alterations, and <del>total or partial</del> demolition to <u>an existing building or structure, other</u> than an accessory building or structure on a contributory site.	Open Submission
OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR1-R6: New or relocated buildings or structures on a Contributory site, not otherwise provided for by OVR1-R2	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.99	Support	Supports Rule OVR1-R6 and the Restricted Discretionary activity status.	Retain Rule OVR1-R6 as notified.	Open Submission
OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR1-R7: Activities infringing standards OVR1-S1 - OVR1-S6 on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.107	Support	Supports Rule OVR1-R7: Activities infringing standards OVR-S1 - OVR-S6 on a Contributory site and the Restricted Discretionary activity status.	Retain Rule OVR1-R7 as notified.	Open Submission
OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR1-R8: Total demolition or relocation off site of a primary building or structure on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.114	Amend	HNZPT considers that while Rule OVR1-R8 and the Non-Complying status for demolition and relocation of primary buildings and structures on contributory sites are supported. There are three examples of Rule 8 which do not refer to the primary buildings or structures, and thus create a conflict with Rule 4 of each of those sections. Overlays 2, 4, and 7 contain this apparent contradiction.	Retain Rule OVR1-R8 but amend Rules OVR2-R8, OVR4-R8, and OVR7-R8 to include wording to correct this error as follows:  Total demolition or relocation off site of a <del>primary</del> -building or structure on a Contributory site	Open Submission
OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR1-R12: Total or partial demolition or relocation of an accessory or primary building or structure on a Non-contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.119	Amend	The submitter considers it necessary to amend the wording of the Historic Heritage Overlay Rules (beginning with OVR1-R12) to remove wording inconsistencies. Specifically, amendments as follows to make the Rules logical and ordered: Amend Rule 12 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to partial demolition; Amend Rule 13 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to total demolition and relocation; There appears to be an error in OVR-R13, in which the title of OVR3-R13 should be non-contributory not contributory; In OVR3 there is no Rule managing alterations and additions of primary buildings on non-contributory sites (the equivalent Rule 14 found in OVR 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7). This may be an error which needs to be rectified; The text 'PREC3-R14A' appears to be an error in Overlay Area 2.	Amend Historic Heritage Overlay Rules as follows:  OVR1-R12 Total <del>or partial</del> demolition or relocation of an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7]. OVR1-R13: External alterations, additions, <del>total or partial</del> demolition or <del>relocation</del> to an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7]. In addition, amend OVR3-R13 to refer to <u>non</u> -contributory site.  Add the following rule to  OVR3: External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site.  Amend OVR2-R14: <del>PREC3</del> -OVR2-R14A	Open Submission

# OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR1-R13: External alterations, additions, total or partial demolition, or relocation to an accessory building or structure on a Non-contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.120	Amend	The submitter considers it necessary to amend the wording of the Historic Heritage Overlay Rules (OVR1-R13 and the following) to remove wording inconsistencies. Specifically, amendments as follows to make the Rules logical and ordered: Amend Rule 12 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to partial demolition; Amend Rule 13 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to total demolition and relocation; There appears to be an error in OVR-R13, in which the title of OVR3-R13 should be non-contributory not contributory; In OVR3 there is no Rule managing alterations and additions of primary buildings on non-contributory sites (the equivalent Rule 14 found in OVR 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7). This may be an error which needs to be rectified; The text 'PREC3-R14A' appears to be an error in Overlay Area 2.	Amend Historic Heritage Overlay Rules as follows: OVR1-R12 Total or <del>partial</del> demolition or relocation of an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7]. OVR1-R13: External alterations, additions, <del>total</del> or partial demolition or <del>relocation</del> to an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7]. In addition, amend OVR3-R13 to refer to <u>non</u> -contributory site.  Add the following Rule to  OVR3: External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. Amend OVR2-R14: <del>PREC3</del> -OVR2-R14A	Open Submission
OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR1-R14: External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a Non-contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.121	Amend	The submitter considers it necessary to amend the wording of the Historic Heritage Overlay Rules to remove wording inconsistencies. Specifically, amendments as follows to make the Rules logical and ordered: Amend Rule 12 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to partial demolition; Amend Rule 13 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to total demolition and relocation; There appears to be an error in OVR-R13, in which the title of OVR3-R13 should be non-contributory not contributory; In OVR3 there is no Rule managing alterations and additions of primary buildings on non-contributory sites (the equivalent Rule 14 found in OVR 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7). This may be an error which needs to be rectified; The text 'PREC3-R14A' appears to be an error in Overlay Area 2.	Amend Historic Heritage Overlay Rules as follows: OVR1-R12 Total or <del>partial</del> demolition or relocation of an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7].  OVR1-R13: External alterations, additions, <del>total</del> or partial demolition or <del>relocation</del> to an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7]. In addition, amend OVR3-R13 to refer to <u>non</u> -contributory site.  Add the following Rule to  OVR3: External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site.  Amend OVR2-R14: <del>PREC3</del> -OVR2-R14A	Open Submission
OVR1 - Harbour Reserve Historic Heritage Overlay /Assessment criteria /General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.137	Amend	HNZPT is generally supportive of the assessment criteria in each Overlay. However, in relation to the HNZPT requested changes to the Historic Heritage Overlay Rules, in particular Rules 12, 13 and 14 in OVR 1-3 and OVR5-7, there will be a need for consequential amendments to the Assessment criteria.	Amend Assessment criteria to be consistent with any changes to the Rules following the HNZPT Submission Points for each Historic Heritage Overlay.	Open Submission

# OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay - Standards Table /OVR2-S5: Fences and walls	Susan Dallas	25.7	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay - Standards Table /OVR2-S5: Fences and walls	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.7	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table	Tom Anderson	151.49	Amend	Considers that due to the presence of this provision, that the customer connection to heritage buildings or items as sought in this submission applies to this heritage overlay.	Seeks confirmation that due to the presence of this provision, that the customer connection to heritage buildings or items as sought in this submission applies to this heritage overlay.	Open Submission
OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.44	Amend	Council wishes to enable continued use, including solar panels, on heritage items provided that heritage values are not compromised.	Add new permitted activity rule (for both contributory and non-contributory sites):  Minor external alterations to any Group A or Group B heritage item that are associated with: i) Security alarms ii) Security lighting iii) Any attachment that is not visible from a road or public space, excluding signage	Open Submission
OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay /Objectives /OVR2-O2: Protect and maintain historic heritage values of the Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.63	Support	Supports Objective OVR2-O2: Protect and maintain heritage values of the Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay as the objective with its reference to protection and maintenance of historic heritage values of each area is supported.	Retain Objective OVR2-O2 as notified.	Open Submission
OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR2-P2: Cumulative adverse effects	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.71	Support	Supports OVR2-P2: Cumulative adverse effects as the reference to avoiding cumulative effects to the historic heritage values of Overlay areas is supported.	Retain OVR2-P2: Cumulative adverse effects as notified.	Open Submission
OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR2-R4: External alterations, addition, total or partial demolition, or relocation to an accessory building on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.86	Oppose	Opposes OVR2-R4: External alterations, addition, total or partial demolition, or relocation to an accessory building on a Contributory site wording as a lower level of control on the construction of new accessory buildings and alterations to existing accessory buildings is appropriate. It is noted that the proposed Rule 4 allows for the total demolition of accessory buildings as a permitted activity. Rules regarding demolition of accessory buildings (Rule 4) appears to conflict with rules regarding total demolition 'of any building or structure' (Rule 8) on Contributing sites in some overlay areas. This conflict is apparent comparing Rules 4 and 8 in Overlays 2, 4, and 7.	Retain Rules pertaining to accessory buildings on contributory sites.	Open Submission
OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR2-R5: External alterations, addition, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.93	Support	Supports OVR2-R5: External alterations, addition, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site. However, Rule OVR3-R5 refers to 'accessory buildings' and is essentially a repeat of OVR3-R4 necessitating an amendment.	Retain OVR2-R5, with the exception of OVR3-R5 to be amended as follows: External additions, alterations, and <del>total or</del> partial demolition to <u>an existing building or structure, other</u> than an accessory building or structure on a contributory site.	Open Submission
OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR2-R6: New or relocated buildings or structures on a Contributory site, not otherwise provided for in OVR2-R2	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.100	Support	Supports Rule OVR2-R6 and the Restricted Discretionary activity status.	Retain Rule OVR2-R6 as notified.	Open Submission
OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR2-R7: Activities infringing standards OVR2-S1 - OVR2-S5 on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.108	Support	Supports Rule OVR2-R7 and the Restricted Discretionary activity status.	Retain Rule OVR2-R7 as notified.	Open Submission

# OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR2-R12: Total or partial demolition, or relocation on an accessory or primary building or structure on a Non-contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.122	Amend	The submitter considers it necessary to amend the wording of the Historic Heritage Overlay Rules to remove wording inconsistencies. Specifically, amendments as follows to make the Rules logical and ordered: Amend Rule 12 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to partial demolition; Amend Rule 13 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to total demolition and relocation; There appears to be an error in OVR-R13, in which the title of OVR3-R13 should be non-contributory not contributory; In OVR3 there is no Rule managing alterations and additions of primary buildings on non-contributory sites (the equivalent Rule 14 found in OVR 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7). This may be an error which needs to be rectified; The text ‘PREC3-R14A’ appears to be an error in Overlay Area 2.	Amend Historic Heritage Overlay Rules as follows:  OVR1-R12 Total or <del>partial</del> demolition or relocation of an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7].  OVR1-R13: External alterations, additions, <del>total</del> or partial demolition or <del>relocation</del> to an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7]. In addition, amend OVR3-R13 to refer to <u>non</u> -contributory site.  Add the following Rule to  OVR3: External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site.  Amend OVR2-R14: <del>PREC3</del> -OVR2-R14A	Open Submission
OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR2-R13: External alterations, additions, total or partial demolition, or relocation to an accessory building or structure on a Non-contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.123	Amend	The submitter considers it necessary to amend the wording of the Historic Heritage Overlay Rules to remove wording inconsistencies. Specifically, amendments as follows to make the Rules logical and ordered: Amend Rule 12 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to partial demolition; Amend Rule 13 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to total demolition and relocation; There appears to be an error in OVR-R13, in which the title of OVR3-R13 should be non-contributory not contributory; In OVR3 there is no Rule managing alterations and additions of primary buildings on non-contributory sites (the equivalent Rule 14 found in OVR 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7). This may be an error which needs to be rectified; The text ‘PREC3-R14A’ appears to be an error in Overlay Area 2.	Amend Historic Heritage Overlay Rules as follows:  OVR1-R12 Total or <del>partial</del> demolition or relocation of an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7].  OVR1-R13: External alterations, additions, <del>total</del> or partial demolition or <del>relocation</del> to an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7]. In addition, amend OVR3-R13 to refer to <u>non</u> -contributory site.  Add the following Rule to  OVR3: External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. Amend OVR2-R14: <del>PREC3</del> -OVR2-R14A	Open Submission

# OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR2-R14: External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a Non-contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.124		The submitter considers it necessary to amend the wording of the Historic Heritage Overlay Rules to remove wording inconsistencies. Specifically, amendments as follows to make the Rules logical and ordered: Amend Rule 12 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to partial demolition; Amend Rule 13 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to total demolition and relocation; There appears to be an error in OVR-R13, in which the title of OVR3-R13 should be non-contributory not contributory; In OVR3 there is no Rule managing alterations and additions of primary buildings on non-contributory sites (the equivalent Rule 14 found in OVR 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7). This may be an error which needs to be rectified; The text 'PREC3-R14A' appears to be an error in Overlay Area 2.	Amend Historic Heritage Overlay Rules as follows: OVR1-R12 Total or <del>partial</del> demolition or relocation of an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7].  OVR1-R13: External alterations, additions, <del>total</del> or partial demolition or <del>relocation</del> to an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7].  In addition, amend OVR3-R13 to refer to non-contributory site.  Add the following Rule to  OVR3: External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. Amend OVR2-R14: <del>PREC3</del> -OVR2-R14A	Open Submission
OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay /Assessment criteria /General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.138	Amend	HNZPT is generally supportive of the assessment criteria in each Overlay. However, in relation to the HNZPT requested changes to the Historic Heritage Overlay Rules, in particular Rules 12, 13 and 14 in OVR 1-3 and OVR5-7, there will be a need for consequential amendments to the Assessment criteria.	Amend Assessment criteria to be consistent with any changes to the Rules following the HNZPT Submission Points for each Historic Heritage Overlay.	Open Submission
OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR2-P3: New buildings and structures	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.190	Support	Supports OVR2-P3: New buildings and structures as the intent of the Policy is supported with its reference to ensuring that new buildings are sympathetic with existing heritage values.	Retain OVR2-P3: New buildings and structures as notified.	Open Submission
OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR2-P4: Alterations, additions, and partial demolition	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.197	Support	Supports OVR2-P4 as the intention of the policy is supported.	Retain OVR2-P4 as notified.	Open Submission
OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR2-P5: Total demolition and removal on Non-contributory sites	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.204	Support	Considers that these policies (OVR1-P6 OVR2-P5 OVR3-P5 OVR5-P5 OVR6-P5 OVR7-P5 OVR8-P6) are supported as being appropriate for non-contributory sites. The associated rule for this policy uses the term relocation rather than removal. It is preferable to use consistent terms through an amendment.	Amend Policies OVR1-P6 OVR2-P5 OVR3-P5 OVR5-P5 OVR6-P5 OVR7-P5 OVR8-P6 as follows:  Total demolition and <del>Removal</del> relocation of buildings and structures on Non-contributory sites	Open Submission
OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR2-P6: Total demolition and removal on Contributory Sites	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.210	Support	Supports the use of the term 'Avoid' as well as the consideration of alternatives for Policies OVR1-P7 OVR2-P6 OVR3-P6 OVR4-P6 OVR5-P6 OVR6-P6 OVR7-P6 OVR8-P7.	Retain Policies OVR1-P7 OVR2-P6 OVR3-P6 OVR4-P6 OVR5-P6 OVR6-P6 OVR7-P6 OVR8-P7 pertaining to demolition of buildings on contributory sites.	Open Submission
OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR2-R1: Maintenance and repair of any existing building or structure on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.217	Support	HNZPT supports the Permitted activity rule for maintenance and repair.(OVR1 to OVR8 inclusive)	Retain Maintenance and repair Rules as notified.	Open Submission
OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR2-R2: Accessory buildings and structures, not including fences and/or walls, on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.224	Amend	HNZPT considers that while R2 Overlays Rules for Ancillary / accessory buildings and structures, not including fences and walls, on a Contributory site (Overlays 1 to 7 inclusive) are supported, there is however inconsistency in OVR1-R2 over its use of the word 'Ancillary' versus 'Accessory' for the other Overlays. Accessory building is preferred, as it is a Defined term in the Plan.	Amend Rule OVR1-R2 by replacing the word <del>ancillary</del> with <u>accessory</u> .	Open Submission
OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR2 - Coronation Street Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR2-R8: Total demolition or relocation offsite of a building or structure on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.229	Amend	HNZPT considers that while Rule OVR1-R8 and the Non-Complying status for demolition and relocation of primary buildings and structures on contributory sites are supported. There are three examples of Rule 8 which do not refer to the primary buildings or structures, and thus create a conflict with Rule 4 of each of those sections. Overlays 2, 4, and 7 contain this apparent contradiction.	Retain Rule OVR1-R8 but amend Rules OVR2-R8, OVR4-R8, and OVR7-R8 to include wording to correct this error as follows:  Total demolition or relocation off site of a <u>primary</u> building or structure on a Contributory site	Open Submission

# OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay - Standards Table /OVR3-S6: Fences and walls	Susan Dallas	25.8	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay - Standards Table /OVR3-S6: Fences and walls	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.8	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay /Objectives /OVR3-O2: Protect and maintain heritage values of the Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay	Michael Keukelaar	48.1	Oppose	Considers that consideration be given for greater front fence allowances for corner sites. Considers that front fences in the Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay be permitted to be built to a maximum of 2m in height, subject to an approved art deco design, or at the very least permitted to replace existing higher fences with one of an art deco design.	Amend rules relating to front fences to give greater consideration of corner sites. Amend front fence rules in the Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay to enable front fences to be built up to 2m in height subject to approved art deco design, or for existing fences to be replaced to the same height with one of an art deco design.	Open Submission
OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table	Tom Anderson	151.50	Amend	Considers that confirmation is needed, due to the presence of this provision, that the customer connection to heritage buildings or items as sought in this submission applies to this heritage overlay.	Seeks confirmation due to the presence of this provision, that the customer connection to heritage buildings or items as sought in this submission applies to this heritage overlay.	Open Submission
OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.45	Amend	Council wishes to enable continued use, including solar panels, on heritage items provided that heritage values are not compromised.	Add new permitted activity rule (for both contributory and non-contributory sites):  Minor external alterations to any Group A or Group B heritage item that are associated with: i) Security alarms ii) Security lighting iii) Any attachment that is not visible from a road or public space, excluding signage	Open Submission
OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR3-R5: External alterations, additions, total or partial demolition or relocation to an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.68	Amend	Rule OVR3-R5 is intended to apply to alterations, additions, total or partial demolition or relocation of buildings other than an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site. This is an error.	Update heading of Rule OVR3-R5 so it applies to buildings other than an accessory building of structure on a Contributory site.	Open Submission
OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay /Objectives /OVR3-O2: Protect and maintain heritage values of the Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.64	Support	Supports Objective OVR3-O2: Protect and maintain heritage values of the Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay as the objective with its reference to protection and maintenance of historic heritage values of each area.	Retain Objective OVR3-O2: Protect and maintain heritage values of the Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay as notified.	Open Submission
OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR3-P2: Cumulative adverse effects	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.72	Support	Supports OVR3-P2: Cumulative adverse effects as the reference to avoiding cumulative effects to the historic heritage values of Overlay areas is supported.	Retain OVR3-P2: Cumulative adverse effects as notified.	Open Submission
OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR3-R4: External additions, alterations, and total or partial demolition to an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.87	Oppose	Opposes Rule OVR3-R4: External additions, alterations, and total or partial demolition to an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site wording as a lower level of control on the construction of new accessory buildings and alterations to existing accessory buildings is appropriate. It is noted that the proposed Rule 4 allows for the total demolition of accessory buildings as a permitted activity. Rules regarding demolition of accessory buildings (Rule 4) appears to conflict with rules regarding total demolition 'of any building or structure' (Rule 8) on Contributing sites in some overlay areas. This conflict is apparent comparing Rules 4 and 8 in Overlays 2, 4, and 7.	Retain Rules pertaining to accessory buildings on contributory sites.	Open Submission
OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR3-R5: External alterations, additions, total or partial demolition or relocation to an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.94	Support	Considers Rule OVR3-R5 requires amendment as it refers to 'accessory buildings' and is essentially a repeat of OVR3-R4.	Amend OVR3-R5 as follows:  External additions, alterations, and <del>total or partial demolition</del> to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a contributory site.	Open Submission



# OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR3-R6: New or relocated structures on a Contributory site, not otherwise provided for by OVR3-R2	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.101	Support	Supports Rule OVR3-R6 and the Restricted Discretionary activity status.	Retain Rule OVR3-R6: New or relocated structures on a Contributory site, not otherwise provided for by OVR3-R2 as notified.	Open Submission
OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR3-R7: Activities infringing standards OVR3-S1 - OVR3-S6	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.109	Support	Supports Rule OVR3-R7: Activities infringing standards OVR3-S1 - OVR3 - S6 and the Restricted Discretionary activity status.	Retain Rule OVR3-R7 as notified.	Open Submission
OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR3-R4: External additions, alterations, and total or partial demolition to an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.117	Amend	HNZPT considers OVR3-R4: External additions, alterations, and total or partial demolition to an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site requires amending together with OVR3-R10: Accessory buildings and structures, not including fences and/or walls; on a Non-contributory site as there are erroneous Precinct references to PREC4-R4B in the former and PREC4-R10B in the latter.	Amend OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay Rules OVR3-R4 and OVR3-R10 as follows:  <del>PREC4-OVR3-R4B</del> <del>PREC4-OVR3-R10B</del>	Open Submission
OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR3-R10: Accessory buildings and structures, not including fences and/or walls; on a Non-contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.118	Amend	The submitter considers Rules OVR3-R4: External additions, alterations, and total or partial demolition to an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site and OVR3-R10: Accessory buildings and structures, not including fences and/or walls; on a Non-contributory site require amending as there are erroneous Precinct references to PREC4-R4B and PREC4-R10B in the former and PREC4-R10B in the latter.	Amend Rules OVR3-R4: External additions, alterations, and total or partial demolition to an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site and OVR3-R10: Accessory buildings and structures, not including fences and/or walls; on a Non-contributory site as follows:  <del>PREC4-OVR3-R4B</del> <del>PREC4-OVR3-R10B</del>	Open Submission
OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR3-R12: Total or partial demolition or relocation off site of an accessory or primary building or structure on a Non-contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.125	Amend	The submitter considers it necessary to amend the wording of the Historic Heritage Overlay Rules to remove wording inconsistencies. Specifically, amendments as follows to make the Rules logical and ordered: Amend Rule 12 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to partial demolition; Amend Rule 13 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to total demolition and relocation; There appears to be an error in OVR-R13, in which the title of OVR3-R13 should be non-contributory not contributory; In OVR3 there is no Rule managing alterations and additions of primary buildings on non-contributory sites (the equivalent Rule 14 found in OVR 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7). This may be an error which needs to be rectified; The text 'PREC3-R14A' appears to be an error in Overlay Area 2.	Amend Historic Heritage Overlay Rules as follows:  OVR1-R12 Total or <del>partial</del> demolition or relocation of an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7].  OVR1-R13: External alterations, additions, <del>total</del> or partial demolition or <del>relocation</del> to an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7]. In addition, amend OVR3-R13 to refer to <u>non</u> -contributory site.  Add the following Rule to  OVR3: External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site.  Amend OVR2-R14: <del>PREC3-OVR2-R14A</del>	Open Submission

# OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR3-R13: External alterations, additions, total or partial demolition or relocation to an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site.	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.126	Amend	The submitter considers it necessary to amend the wording of the Historic Heritage Overlay Rules to remove wording inconsistencies. Specifically, amendments as follows to make the Rules logical and ordered: Amend Rule 12 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to partial demolition; Amend Rule 13 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to total demolition and relocation; There appears to be an error in OVR-R13, in which the title of OVR3-R13 should be non-contributory not contributory; In OVR3 there is no Rule managing alterations and additions of primary buildings on non-contributory sites (the equivalent Rule 14 found in OVR 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7). This may be an error which needs to be rectified; The text 'PREC3-R14A' appears to be an error in Overlay Area 2.	Amend Historic Heritage Overlay Rules as follows:  OVR1-R12 Total <del>or partial</del> demolition or relocation of an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7].  OVR1-R13: External alterations, additions, <del>total</del> or partial demolition or <del>relocation</del> to an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7].  In addition, amend OVR3-R13 to refer to <u>non</u> -contributory site.  Add the following Rule to  OVR3: External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site.  Amend OVR2-R14: <del>PREC3</del> OVR2-R14A	Open Submission
OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR3-R14: New or relocated buildings or structures not otherwise provided for by OVR3-R10 on a Non-contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.127	Amend	The submitter considers it necessary to amend the wording of the Historic Heritage Overlay Rules to remove wording inconsistencies. Specifically, amendments as follows to make the Rules logical and ordered: Amend Rule 12 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to partial demolition; Amend Rule 13 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to total demolition and relocation; There appears to be an error in OVR-R13, in which the title of OVR3-R13 should be non-contributory not contributory; In OVR3 there is no Rule managing alterations and additions of primary buildings on non-contributory sites (the equivalent Rule 14 found in OVR 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7). This may be an error which needs to be rectified; The text 'PREC3-R14A' appears to be an error in Overlay Area 2.	Amend Historic Heritage Overlay Rules as follows:  OVR1-R12 Total <del>or partial</del> demolition or relocation of an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7].  OVR1-R13: External alterations, additions, <del>total</del> or partial demolition or <del>relocation</del> to an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7]. In addition, amend OVR3-R13 to refer to <u>non</u> -contributory site.  Add the following Rule to  OVR3: External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site.  Amend OVR2-R14: <del>PREC3</del> OVR2-R14A	Open Submission
OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay /Assessment criteria /General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.139	Amend	HNZPT is generally supportive of the assessment criteria in each Overlay. However, in relation to the HNZPT requested changes to the Historic Heritage Overlay Rules, in particular Rules 12, 13 and 14 in OVR 1-3 and OVR5-7, there will be a need for consequential amendments to the Assessment criteria.	Amend Assessment criteria to be consistent with any changes to the Rules following the HNZPT Submission Points for each Historic Heritage Overlay.	Open Submission
OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR3-P3: New buildings and structures	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.191	Support	Supports OVR3-P3: New buildings and structures as the intent of the policy is supported with its reference to ensuring that new buildings are sympathetic with existing heritage values.	Retain OVR3-P3: New buildings and structures as notified.	Open Submission
OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR3-P4: Alterations, additions, and partial demolition	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.198	Support	Supports OVR3-P4 as the intention of the Policy is supported.	Retain OVR3-P4 as notified.	Open Submission
OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR3-P5: Total demolition and removal on Non-contributory sites	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.206	Support	Considers that these policies (OVR1-P6 OVR2-P5 OVR3-P5 OVR5-P5 OVR6-P5 OVR7-P5 OVR8-P6) are supported as being appropriate for non-contributory sites. The associated rule for this policy uses the term relocation rather than removal. It is preferable to use consistent terms through an amendment.	Amend Policies OVR1-P6 OVR2-P5 OVR3-P5 OVR5-P5 OVR6-P5 OVR7-P5 OVR8-P6 as follows:  Total demolition and <del>removal</del> relocation of buildings and structures on Non-contributory sites	Open Submission

# OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR4-P6: Total demolition and removal on Contributory sites	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.211	Support	Supports the use of the term 'Avoid' as well as the consideration of alternatives for Policies OVR1-P7 OVR2-P6 OVR3-P6 OVR4-P6 OVR5-P6 OVR6-P6 OVR7-P6 OVR8-P7.	Retain Policies OVR1-P7 OVR2-P6 OVR3-P6 OVR4-P6 OVR5-P6 OVR6-P6 OVR7-P6 OVR8-P7 pertaining to demolition of buildings on contributory sites.	Open Submission
OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR3-R1: Maintenance and repair of any existing building or structure on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.218	Support	HNZPT supports the Permitted activity rule for maintenance and repair.(OVR1 to OVR8 inclusive)	Retain Maintenance and repair Rules as notified.	Open Submission
OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR3-R2: Accessory residential buildings and structures, not including fences and/or walls, on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.225	Amend	HNZPT considers that while R2 Overlays Rules for Ancillary / accessory buildings and structures, not including fences and walls, on a Contributory site (Overlays 1 to 7 inclusive) are supported, there is however inconsistency in OVR1-R2 over its use of the word 'Ancillary' versus 'Accessory' for the other Overlays. Accessory building is preferred, as it is a Defined term in the Plan.	Amend Rule OVR1-R2 by replacing the word <del>ancillary</del> with <u>accessory</u> .	Open Submission

# OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay - Standards Table /OVR4-S6: Fences and walls	Susan Dallas	25.9	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay - Standards Table /OVR4-S6: Fences and walls	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.9	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table	Tom Anderson	151.51	Amend	Considers that it needs to be confirmed that due to the presence of this provision, that the customer connection to heritage buildings or items as sought in this submission applies to this heritage overlay.	Seeks confirmation that due to the presence of this provision, that the customer connection to heritage buildings or items as sought in this submission applies to this heritage overlay.	Open Submission
OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.46	Amend	Council wishes to enable continued use, including solar panels, on heritage items provided that heritage values are not compromised.	Add new permitted activity rule (for both contributory and non-contributory sites):  Minor external alterations to any Group A or Group B heritage item that are associated with: i) Security alarms ii) Security lighting iii) Any attachment that is not visible from a road or public space, excluding signage	Open Submission
OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay /Objectives /OVR4-O2: Protect and maintain the historic heritage values of the Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.65	Support	Supports Objective OVR4-O2: Protect and maintain the historic heritage values of the Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay as the objective with its reference to protection and maintenance of historic heritage values of each area is supported.	Retain Objective OVR4-O2: Protect and maintain the historic heritage values of the Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay as notified.	Open Submission
OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR4-P2: Cumulative adverse effects	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.73	Support	Supports OVR4-P2: Cumulative adverse effects as the reference to avoiding cumulative effects to the historic heritage values of Overlay areas is supported.	Retain OVR4-P2: Cumulative adverse effects as notified.	Open Submission
OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR4-R4: External alterations, additions, total or partial demolition, or relocation of an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.88	Oppose	Opposes Rule OVR4-R4: External alterations, additions, total or partial demolition, or relocation of an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site wording as a lower level of control on the construction of new accessory buildings and alterations to existing accessory buildings is appropriate. It is noted that the proposed Rule 4 allows for the total demolition of accessory buildings as a permitted activity. Rules regarding demolition of accessory buildings (Rule 4) appears to conflict with rules regarding total demolition 'of any building or structure' (Rule 8) on Contributing sites in some overlay areas. This conflict is apparent comparing Rules 4 and 8 in Overlays 2, 4, and 7.	Retain Rules pertaining to accessory buildings on contributory sites.	Open Submission
OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR4-R5: External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to any existing building or structure on a Contributory site, other than an accessory building or structure	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.95	Support	Supports OVR4-R5: External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to any existing building or structure on a Contributory site, other than an accessory building or structure. However, Rule OVR3-R5 refers to 'accessory buildings' and is essentially a repeat of OVR3-R4 necessitating an amendment.	Retain OVR4-R5, with the exception of OVR3-R5 to be amended as follows:  External additions, alterations, and <del>total or</del> partial demolition to <u>an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a contributory site.</u>	Open Submission
OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR4-R6: New or relocated buildings or structures not otherwise provided for by OVR4-R4 on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.102	Support	Supports Rule OVR4-R6 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay and the Restricted Discretionary activity status.	Retain Rule OVR4-R6 as notified.	Open Submission
OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR4-R7: Activities infringing standards OVR4-S1 - OVR4-S6	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.110	Support	Supports Rule OVR4-R7 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay and the Restricted Discretionary activity status.	Retain Rule OVR4-R7 as notified.	Open Submission

# OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR4-R8: Total demolition or relocation off site of a building or structure on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.115	Amend	Considers Rule OVR4-R8 requires amendment as while generally supported, it creates inconsistency with other Plan provisions. There are three examples of Rule 8 which do not refer to 'primary' buildings or structures, and this creates a conflict with Rule 4 of each of those sections. Overlays 2, 4, and 7 contain this apparent contradiction.	Amend Rules OVR2-R8, OVR4-R8, and OVR7-R8 to include wording to correct this error as follows:  Total demolition or relocation off site of a <u>primary</u> building or structure on a Contributory site	Open Submission
OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR4-P3: New buildings and structures	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.192		Supports OVR4-P3: New buildings and structures as the intent of the policy is supported with its reference to ensuring that new buildings are sympathetic with existing heritage values.	Retain OVR4-P3: New buildings and structures as notified.	Open Submission
OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR4-P4: Alterations, additions, and partial demolition	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.199	Support	Supports OVR4-P4 as the intention of the policy is supported.	Retain OVR4-P4 as notified.	Open Submission
OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR4-P6: Total demolition and removal	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.212	Support	Supports the use of the term 'Avoid' as well as the consideration of alternatives for Policies OVR1-P7 OVR2-P6 OVR3-P6 OVR4-P6 OVR5-P6 OVR6-P6 OVR7-P6 OVR8-P7.	Retain Policies OVR1-P7 OVR2-P6 OVR3-P6 OVR4-P6 OVR5-P6 OVR6-P6 OVR7-P6 OVR8-P7 pertaining to demolition of buildings on contributory sites.	Open Submission
OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR4-R1: Maintenance and repair of any existing building or structure on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.219	Support	HNZPT supports the Permitted activity rule for maintenance and repair.(OVR1 to OVR8 inclusive)	Retain Maintenance and repair Rules as notified.	Open Submission
OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR4 - Marewa State Housing Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR4-R2: Accessory buildings and structures, not including fences and/or walls, on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.226	Amend	HNZPT considers that while R2 Overlays Rules for Ancillary / accessory buildings and structures, not including fences and walls, on a Contributory site (Overlays 1 to 7 inclusive) are supported, there is however inconsistency in OVR1-R2 over its use of the word 'Ancillary' versus 'Accessory' for the other Overlays. Accessory building is preferred, as it is a Defined term in the Plan.	Amend Rule OVR1-R2 by replacing the word <del>ancillary</del> with <u>accessory</u> .	Open Submission

# OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay - Standards Table /OVR5-S4: Fences and walls	Susan Dallas	25.10	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.(Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay - Standards Table /OVR5-S4: Fences and walls	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.10	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /	Sheena Revington Peter Revington	114.2	Oppose	Considers that McDonald Street and Vigor Brown Street have significant heritage character, and both should be protected with a Heritage Overlay as stated in the independent review of heritage character areas in Napier by Graham Linwood, registered architect ("Heritage Review"). The Heritage Review found that both McDonald Street and Vigor Brown Street (between Carnell Street and Latham Street) contained a high percentage of properties that define the character of the area. Considers that the proposed zoning is inconsistent with the findings of the report as Vigor Brown Street is not even retained as a General Residential Zone, but is in a High Density Residential Zone – zoning that allows and encourages the complete destruction of heritage character.	Amend so hat the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay includes the Vigor Brown Area between Carnell Street and Kennedy Road	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /	Kate Graham	119.1	Amend	Extend Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay to include the section of Vigor Brown Street from Cornell St to the north to the corner of Kennedy Rd to the south. Amend the underlying zoning of this area from HRZ to General Residential Zone. The characteristics described within the Napier South Historic Heritage overlay are also applicable to those of Vigor Brown St, as evidenced by the Graham Linwood Heritage Character report.	Extend Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay to include the section of Vigor Brown Street from Cornell St to the north to the corner of Kennedy Rd to the south. Amend the underlying zoning of this area from HRZ to General Residential Zone.	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /Issues /OVR5-I1: Inappropriate subdivision, use, and development may compromise the historic heritage values within the overlay	Kate Graham	119.4	Support	Supports the inclusion of the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay with the addition of the inclusion of Vigor Brown Street (between Carnell Street and Kennedy Road) as sought in the submission point above.	No relief sought	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /Objectives /OVR5-O1: Identify the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay	Kate Graham	119.5	Amend	Support the identification of the Napier South Heritage alert Overlay. I request that the mapped area is amended to include the section of Vigor Brown Street from Carnell Street to Kennedy Road	Amend planning maps to include the section of Vigor Brown Street from Carnell Street to Kennedy Road within OVR-5 and that the underlying zone (as mapped on the District Plan maps) for this section of Vigor Brown Street is changed from High Density Residential to General Residential.	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR5-P1: Identify Contributory sites and map the extent of the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay	Kate Graham	119.6	Amend	Amend the Napier South Heritage Alert Overlay to include the 28 primary and 13 contributory properties identified in the independent review of heritage character areas in Napier commissioned by Napier City Council in 2019: Napier Heritage Character Areas Study: A review of existing heritage character areas and an assessment of new heritage character areas. Graham Linwood, registered architect. December 2019: source ncc.govt.nz)	Amend the Napier South Heritage Alert Overlay to include the 28 primary and 13 contributory properties identified in the independent review of heritage character areas in Napier commissioned by Napier City Council in 2019: Napier Heritage Character Areas Study: A review of existing heritage character areas and an assessment of new heritage character areas. Graham Linwood, registered architect. December 2019: source ncc.govt.nz)	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table	Tom Anderson	151.52	Amend	Considers that confirmation is needed, due to the presence of this provision, that the customer connection to heritage buildings or items as sought in this submission applies to this heritage overlay.	Seeks confirmation that due to the presence of this provision, that the customer connection to heritage buildings or items as sought in this submission applies to this heritage overlay.	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /	- Angie Denby	154.2	Amend	Extend the Napier South Heritage Overlay to Vigor Brown St (Carnell St to Kennedy RD). Vigor Brown has high number of original character homes that are well cared for.	Extend the Napier South Heritage Overlay to Vigor Brown St (Carnell St to Kennedy RD).	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay	Martin Wood	157.2	Amend	2020 Graham Linwood heritage character report identified significant character values. HRZ development within Vigor Brown St would impact on heritage values of McDonald St. Extend Napier South heritage Overlay down Vigor Brown St and to not allow any multi-storey developments on the streets that back on to MaDonald and Vigor Brown, i.e. George's Drive and Jull Street..	Extend Napier South heritage Overlay down Vigor Brown St.Not allow multi-storey developments on the streets that back on to McDonald and Vigor Brown St.	Open Submission

# OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.47	Amend	Council wishes to enable continued use, including solar panels, on heritage items provided that heritage values are not compromised.	Add new permitted activity rule (for both contributory and non-contributory sites): Minor external alterations to any Group A or Group B heritage item that are associated with: i) Security alarms ii) Security lighting iii) Any attachment that is not visible from a road or public space, excluding signage	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /General	Damien Shalfoon	239.1	Amend	Considers that the Napier South Historic Overlay (NSHO) should include part of Vigor Brown Street (from the corner of Carnell Street to 48-51 Vigor Brown Street). Fencing restrictions for NSHO should be the same as the General Residential Zone (GRZ). High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) should be amended to exclude Vigor Brown area and the entire area within Georges Drive, Kennedy Road, Carnell Street and Jull Street.Napier South in an area with characterful attributes, which is a reason why buyers and tourists are drawn to the area.The Heritage Review found that McDonald Street and Vigor Brown Street contain a very high percentage of properties that reflect the forgoing description. Accordingly, both streets should be protected by a Heritage overlay and evenly retained as a General Residential Zone.Aesthetics and character of the area that has been preserved, represent the heritage and legacy of successive generations.Submitter can find no requirement for environments like Napier to have HRZ. Other larger cities do not reflect Napier’s situation.It seems contradictory for apartment buildings that are out of scale to even be contemplated.Such buildings would dominate existing neighbourhoods. Further, if not unsightly, such developments without provision for onsite parking, sympathetic landscaping, effective storm water management, proper erosion and sediment control and full emergency access, would most likely increase windage and reduce the light, privacy and safety of adjacent single level dwellings.There is no evidence that HRZ would increase alternative forms of transport.Submitter questions unsupported claims that a range of housing types is required for changing demographics. States Vigor Brown Street has stood the test of time and is an example of social cohesion.	Seeks the inclusion of the Vigor Brown Street from the corner of Carnell Street to 48-51 Vigor Brown Street in the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay, and its exclusion from the HRZ.Seeks the same fencing restrictions as those within GRZ.	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /General	Geoff Mitford - Taylor	258.5	Support	Supports OVR5 Historic Heritage Overlay, although feels it needs to be extended to Carnell, Vigor Brown, and Jull Street. Also, Nelson Crescent, Kennedy - Latham and Tom Parker should be considered.Great to see Art Deco Trust occupying the Womens Rest at Memorial Square which will bring people through town. Perhaps the NCC can follow this example with a Heritage Building instead of replacing one eyesore for another. Our rates would be put to good use buying the old courthouse (D.O.C building) and adjacent to the museum which could be incorporated for better use than storage!	Relief Sought is not included.Inferred Relief Sought - Seeks to Amend OVR5 to include Carnell, Vigor Brown, and Jull Street, and consider the inclusion of Nelson Crescent, Kennedy - Latham and Tom Parker.	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /General	Virginia Mitford - Taylor	259.5	Support	Considers, High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) as it would have adverse effects on submitters property (24A McDonald Street). More of the Historic Overlay houses should be protected, Jull, Vigor Brown and the rest of McDonald should be zoned and historic.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission

# OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /General	David Chan	268.1	Oppose	<p>Considers that the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay should be extended to include Vigor Brown Street (both sides of the street) from Carnell Street to 48-51 Vigor Brown Street (the Vigor Brown area). The Vigor Brown area should be rezoned from High Density Residential to General Residential. The entire area within Georges Drive, Kennedy Road, Carnell Street, and Jull Street (see Attachment 3 of full submission), should be rezoned to General Residential Zone. Fence rules for the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay should be the same as those for the General Residential Zone as there is no need for more restrictive rules and owners have generally erected appropriate fences to the area.</p> <p>The reasons for extending the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay as outlined are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the Graham Linwood Heritage Character Report provides evidence of the areas heritage values and concludes that the both McDonald Street and Vigor Brown Street have high levels of authentic character;</li> <li>- there is no difference in heritage character between the section of McDonald Street that is to be protected and the rest of the street and Vigor Brown Street;</li> <li>- the residents were drawn to live in Napier South because of its heritage character;</li> <li>- the residents value the heritage values including the native timbers and charm of the buildings, and accept the higher costs in maintaining them;</li> <li>- The buildings have survived and thrived for the past century but will not survive the District Plan;</li> <li>- one modern high-rise apartment building (let alone many) would</li> </ul>	<p>No relief sought however it is inferred the relief sought from the submission is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- extend the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay to include Vigor Brown Street (both sides of the street) from Carnell Street to 48-51 Vigor Brown Street (the Vigor Brown area).</li> <li>- Rezone the Vigor Brown area from High Density Residential to General Residential.</li> <li>- Rezone the entire area within Georges Drive, Kennedy Road, Carnell Street, and Jull Street (see Attachment 3 of full submission), to General Residential Zone.</li> <li>- Fence rules for the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay should be the same as those for the General Residential Zone</li> </ul>	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay - Standards Table /OVR5-S4: Fences and walls	David Chan	268.3	Oppose	<p>Considers that the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay should be extended to include Vigor Brown Street (both sides of the street) from Carnell Street to 48-51 Vigor Brown Street (the Vigor Brown area). The Vigor Brown area should be rezoned from High Density Residential to General Residential. The entire area within Georges Drive, Kennedy Road, Carnell Street, and Jull Street (see Attachment 3 of full submission), should be rezoned to General Residential Zone. Fence rules for the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay should be the same as those for the General Residential Zone as there is no need for more restrictive rules and owners have generally erected appropriate fences to the area.</p> <p>The reasons for extending the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay as outlined are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the Graham Linwood Heritage Character Report provides evidence of the areas heritage values and concludes that the both McDonald Street and Vigor Brown Street have high levels of authentic character;</li> <li>- there is no difference in heritage character between the section of McDonald Street that is to be protected and the rest of the street and Vigor Brown Street;</li> <li>- the residents were drawn to live in Napier South because of its heritage character;</li> <li>- the residents value the heritage values including the native timbers and charm of the buildings, and accept the higher costs in maintaining them;</li> <li>- The buildings have survived and thrived for the past century but will not survive the District Plan;</li> <li>- one modern high-rise apartment building (let alone many) would</li> </ul>	<p>No relief sought however it is inferred the relief sought from the submission is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- extend the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay to include Vigor Brown Street (both sides of the street) from Carnell Street to 48-51 Vigor Brown Street (the Vigor Brown area).</li> <li>- Rezone the Vigor Brown area from High Density Residential to General Residential.</li> <li>- Rezone the entire area within Georges Drive, Kennedy Road, Carnell Street, and Jull Street (see Attachment 3 of full submission), to General Residential Zone.</li> <li>- Fence rules for the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay should be the same as those for the General Residential Zone</li> </ul>	Open Submission



# OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /General	Lindsay Manning David Chan	269.1	Oppose	<p>Considers that the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay needs to be extended to include all of Vigor Brown Street and McDonald Street between Carnell Street and Latham Street for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the Graham Linwood Heritage Character Report provides evidence of the areas heritage values and concludes that the both McDonald Street and Vigor Brown Street have high levels of authentic character;</li> <li>- there is no difference in heritage character between the section of McDonald Street that is to be protected and the rest of the street and Vigor Brown Street;</li> <li>- submitter was drawn to live in Napier South because of its heritage character;</li> <li>- submitter has worked hard to renovate and maintain the property to preserve its heritage values;</li> <li>- one modern high-rise apartment building (let alone many) would significantly impact on the heritage character values of the street;</li> </ul> <p>the policy direction set by the NPS:UD has been misconstrued and misapplied</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- allowing high and/or medium density development in the area would result in loss of amenity, and transport and social cohesion issues</li> </ul>	Seeks the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay to include all of Vigor Brown Street and McDonald Street between Carnell Street and Latham Street.	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /Objectives /OVR5-O2: Protect and maintain the historic heritage values of the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.66	Support	Supports Objective OVR5-O2: Protect and maintain the historic heritage values of the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay as the objective with its reference to protection and maintenance of historic heritage values of each area is supported.	Retain Objective OVR5-O2: Protect and maintain the historic heritage values of the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay as notified.	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR5-P2: Cumulative adverse effects	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.74	Support	Supports OVR5-P2: Cumulative adverse effects as the reference to avoiding cumulative effects to the historic heritage values of Overlay areas is supported.	Retain OVR5-P2: Cumulative adverse effects as notified.	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR5-R4: External alterations, additions, and total or partial demolition to an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.89	Oppose	Opposes Rule OVR5-R4: External alterations, additions, and total or partial demolition to an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site wording as a lower level of control on the construction of new accessory buildings and alterations to existing accessory buildings is appropriate. It is noted that the proposed Rule 4 allows for the total demolition of accessory buildings as a permitted activity. Rules regarding demolition of accessory buildings (Rule 4) appears to conflict with rules regarding total demolition 'of any building or structure' (Rule 8) on Contributing sites in some overlay areas. This conflict is apparent comparing Rules 4 and 8 in Overlays 2, 4, and 7.	Retain Rules pertaining to accessory buildings on contributory sites.	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR5-R5: External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.96	Support	Supports OVR5-R5: External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site. However, Rule OVR3-R5 refers to 'accessory buildings' and is essentially a repeat of OVR3-R4 necessitating an amendment.	<p>Retain OVR5-R5, with the exception of OVR3-R5 to be amended as follows:</p> <p>External additions, alterations, and <del>total or</del> partial demolition to <u>an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a contributory site.</u></p>	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR5-R6: New or relocated buildings or structures on a Contributory site not otherwise provided for by OVR5-R2OVR5-R6A	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.103	Support	Supports Rule OVR5-R6 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay and the Restricted Discretionary activity status.	Retain Rule OVR5-R6 as notified.	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR5-R7: Activities infringing standards OVR5-S2 - OVR5-S4	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.111	Support	Supports Rule OVR5-R7: Activities infringing standards OVR5-S2 - OVR5 - S4 and the Restricted Discretionary activity status.	Retain Rule OVR5-R7 as notified.	Open Submission

# OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR5-R10: Accessory buildings and structures, not including fences and walls, on a Non-contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.128	Amend	The submitter considers it necessary to amend the wording of the Historic Heritage Overlay Rules to remove wording inconsistencies. Specifically, amendments as follows to make the Rules logical and ordered: Amend Rule 12 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to partial demolition; Amend Rule 13 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to total demolition and relocation; There appears to be an error in OVR-R13, in which the title of OVR3-R13 should be non-contributory not contributory; In OVR3 there is no Rule managing alterations and additions of primary buildings on non-contributory sites (the equivalent Rule 14 found in OVR 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7). This may be an error which needs to be rectified; The text 'PREC3-R14A' appears to be an error in Overlay Area 2.	Amend Historic Heritage Overlay Rules as follows:  OVR1-R12 <del>Total or partial</del> demolition or relocation of an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7].  OVR1-R13: External alterations, additions, <del>total</del> or partial demolition or <del>relocation</del> to an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7]. In addition, amend OVR3-R13 to refer to <u>non</u> -contributory site.  Add the following Rule to  OVR3: <u>External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site.</u>  Amend OVR2-R14:  <del>PREC3</del> OVR2-R14	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR5-R10: Accessory buildings and structures, not including fences and walls, on a Non-contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.129	Amend	The submitter considers it necessary to amend the wording of the Historic Heritage Overlay Rules to remove wording inconsistencies. Specifically, amendments as follows to make the Rules logical and ordered: Amend Rule 12 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to partial demolition; Amend Rule 13 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to total demolition and relocation; There appears to be an error in OVR-R13, in which the title of OVR3-R13 should be non-contributory not contributory; In OVR3 there is no Rule managing alterations and additions of primary buildings on non-contributory sites (the equivalent Rule 14 found in OVR 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7). This may be an error which needs to be rectified; The text 'PREC3-R14A' appears to be an error in Overlay Area 2.	Amend Historic Heritage Overlay Rules as follows:  OVR1-R12 <del>Total or partial</del> demolition or relocation of an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7].  OVR1-R13: External alterations, additions, <del>total</del> or partial demolition or <del>relocation</del> to an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7]. In addition, amend OVR3-R13 to refer to <u>non</u> -contributory site.  Add the following Rule to  OVR3: <u>External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site.</u>  Amend OVR2-R14:  <del>PREC3</del> OVR2-R14	Open Submission

# OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR5-R10: Accessory buildings and structures, not including fences and walls, on a Non-contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.130	Amend	The submitter considers it necessary to amend the wording of the Historic Heritage Overlay Rules to remove wording inconsistencies. Specifically, amendments as follows to make the Rules logical and ordered: Amend Rule 12 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to partial demolition; Amend Rule 13 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to total demolition and relocation; There appears to be an error in OVR-R13, in which the title of OVR3-R13 should be non-contributory not contributory; In OVR3 there is no Rule managing alterations and additions of primary buildings on non-contributory sites (the equivalent Rule 14 found in OVR 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7). This may be an error which needs to be rectified; The text ‘PREC3-R14A’ appears to be an error in Overlay Area 2.	Amend Historic Heritage Overlay Rules as follows:  OVR1-R12 Total <del>or partial</del> demolition or relocation of an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7].  OVR1-R13: External alterations, additions, <del>total</del> or partial demolition or <del>relocation</del> to an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7]. In addition, amend OVR3-R13 to refer to <u>non</u> -contributory site.  Add the following Rule to  OVR3: External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site.  Amend OVR2-R14:  <del>PREC3</del> OVR2-R14A	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /Assessment criteria /General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.140	Amend	HNZPT is generally supportive of the assessment criteria in each Overlay. However, in relation to the HNZPT requested changes to the Historic Heritage Overlay Rules, in particular Rules 12, 13 and 14 in OVR 1-3 and OVR5-7, there will be a need for consequential amendments to the Assessment criteria.	Amend Assessment criteria to be consistent with any changes to the Rules following the HNZPT Submission Points for each Historic Heritage Overlay.	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR5-P3: New buildings and structures	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.193	Support	Supports OVR5-P3: New buildings and structures as the intent of the policy is supported with its reference to ensuring that new buildings are sympathetic with existing heritage values.	Retain OVR5-P3: New buildings and structures as notified.	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR5-P4: Alterations, additions, and partial demolition	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.200	Support	Supports OVR5-P4 as the intention of the policy is supported.	Retain OVR5-P4 as notified.	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR5-P5: Total demolition or removal for Non-contributory sites	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.205	Support	Considers that these policies (OVR1-P6 OVR2-P5 OVR3-P5 OVR5-P5 OVR6-P5 OVR7-P5 OVR8-P6) are supported as being appropriate for non-contributory sites. The associated rule for this policy uses the term relocation rather than removal. It is preferable to use consistent terms through an amendment.	Amend Policies OVR1-P6 OVR2-P5 OVR3-P5 OVR5-P5 OVR6-P5 OVR7-P5 OVR8-P6 as follows:  Total demolition and <del>Removal</del> relocation of buildings and structures on Non-contributory sites	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR5-P6: Total demolition or removal on Contributory sites	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.213	Support	Supports the use of the term ‘Avoid’ as well as the consideration of alternatives for Policies OVR1-P7 OVR2-P6 OVR3-P6 OVR4-P6 OVR5-P6 OVR6-P6 OVR7-P6 OVR8-P7.	Retain Policies OVR1-P7 OVR2-P6 OVR3-P6 OVR4-P6 OVR5-P6 OVR6-P6 OVR7-P6 OVR8-P7 pertaining to demolition of buildings on contributory sites.	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR5-R1: Maintenance and repair of any building or structure on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.220	Support	HNZPT supports the Permitted activity rule for maintenance and repair.(OVR1 to OVR8 inclusive)	Retain Maintenance and repair Rules as notified.	Open Submission
OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR5 - Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR5-R2: Accessory buildings and structures, not including fences and/or walls, on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.227	Amend	HNZPT considers that while R2 Overlays Rules for Ancillary / accessory buildings and structures, not including fences and walls, on a Contributory site (Overlays 1 to 7 inclusive) are supported, there is however inconsistency in OVR1-R2 over its use of the word ‘Ancillary’ versus ‘Accessory’ for the other Overlays. Accessory building is preferred, as it is a Defined term in the Plan.	Amend Rule OVR1-R2 by replacing the word <del>ancillary</del> with <u>accessory</u> .	Open Submission

# OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay - Standards Table /OVR6-S6: Fences and walls	Susan Dallas	25.11	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay - Standards Table /OVR6-S6: Fences and walls	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.11	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules	Tom Anderson	151.53	Amend	Considers it needs to be confirmed that due to the presence of this provision, that the customer connection to heritage buildings or items as sought in this submission applies to this heritage overlay.	Seeks confirmation that due to the presence of this provision, that the customer connection to heritage buildings or items as sought in this submission applies to this heritage overlay.	Open Submission
OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules /	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.48	Amend	Council wishes to enable continued use, including solar panels, on heritage items provided that heritage values are not compromised.	Add new permitted activity rule (for both contributory and non-contributory sites):  Minor external alterations to any Group A or Group B heritage item that are associated with: i) Security alarms ii) Security lighting  Any attachment that is not visible from a road or public space, excluding signage	Open Submission
OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay /Objectives /OVR6-O2: Protect and maintain the historic heritage values of the Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.67	Support	Supports Objective OVR6-O2: Protect and maintain the historic heritage values of the Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay as the objective with its reference to protection and maintenance of historic heritage values of each area is supported.	Retain Objective OVR6-O2: Protect and maintain the historic heritage values of the Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay as notified.	Open Submission
OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR6-P2: Cumulative adverse effects	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.75	Support	Supports OVR6-P2: Cumulative adverse effects as the reference to avoiding cumulative effects to the historic heritage values of Overlay areas is supported.	Retain OVR6-P2: Cumulative adverse effects as notified.	Open Submission
OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules /OVR6-R4: External alterations, additions, total or partial demolition, or relocation on an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.90	Oppose	Opposes Rule OVR6-R4 wording as a lower level of control on the construction of new accessory buildings and alterations to existing accessory buildings is appropriate. It is noted that the proposed Rule 4 allows for the total demolition of accessory buildings as a permitted activity. Rules regarding demolition of accessory buildings (Rule 4) appears to conflict with rules regarding total demolition 'of any building or structure' (Rule 8) on Contributing sites in some overlay areas. This conflict is apparent comparing Rules 4 and 8 in Overlays 2, 4, and 7.	Retain Rules pertaining to accessory buildings on contributory sites.	Open Submission
OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules /OVR6-R5: External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.97	Support	Supports OVR6-R5: External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site. However, Rule OVR3-R5 refers to 'accessory buildings' and is essentially a repeat of OVR3-R4 necessitating an amendment.	Retain OVR6-R5, with the exception of OVR3-R5 to be amended as follows:  External additions, alterations, and <del>total or</del> partial demolition to <u>an existing building or structure, other</u> than an accessory building or structure on a contributory site.	Open Submission
OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules /OVR6-R6: New or relocated buildings or structures on a Contributory site not otherwise provided for by OVR6-R2	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.104	Support	Supports Rule OVR6-R6 and the Restricted Discretionary activity status.	Retain Rule OVR6-R6: New or relocated buildings or structures on a Contributory site not otherwise provided for by OVR6-R2 as notified.	Open Submission
OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules /OVR6-R7: Activities infringing standards OVR6-S1-OVR6-S6 on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.112	Support	Supports OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay Rule OVR6-R7: Activities infringing standards OVR6-S1 - OVR6 - S6 on a Contributory site and the Restricted Discretionary activity status.	Retain Rule OVR6-R7 as notified in its entirety.	Open Submission

# OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules /OVR6-R12: Total or partial demolition or relocation of an accessory building or primary building or structure on a Non-contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.131	Amend	The submitter considers it necessary to amend the wording of the Historic Heritage Overlay Rules to remove wording inconsistencies. Specifically, amendments as follows to make the Rules logical and ordered: Amend Rule 12 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to partial demolition; Amend Rule 13 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to total demolition and relocation; There appears to be an error in OVR-R13, in which the title of OVR3-R13 should be non-contributory not contributory; In OVR3 there is no Rule managing alterations and additions of primary buildings on non-contributory sites (the equivalent Rule 14 found in OVR 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7). This may be an error which needs to be rectified; The text 'PREC3-R14A' appears to be an error in Overlay Area 2.	Amend Historic Heritage Overlay Rules as follows:  OVR1-R12 Total or <del>partial</del> demolition or relocation of an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7].  OVR1-R13: External alterations, additions, <del>total</del> or partial demolition or <del>relocation</del> to an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7]. In addition, amend OVR3-R13 to refer to <u>non</u> -contributory site.  Add the following Rule to  OVR3: <u>External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site.</u>  Amend OVR2-R14: <del>PREC3</del> OVR2-R14A	Open Submission
OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules /OVR6-R13: External alterations, additions, total or partial demolition, or relocation to an accessory building or structure on a Non-contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.132	Amend	The submitter considers it necessary to amend the wording of the Historic Heritage Overlay Rules to remove wording inconsistencies. Specifically, amendments as follows to make the Rules logical and ordered: Amend Rule 12 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to partial demolition; Amend Rule 13 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to total demolition and relocation; There appears to be an error in OVR-R13, in which the title of OVR3-R13 should be non-contributory not contributory; In OVR3 there is no Rule managing alterations and additions of primary buildings on non-contributory sites (the equivalent Rule 14 found in OVR 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7). This may be an error which needs to be rectified; The text 'PREC3-R14A' appears to be an error in Overlay Area 2.	Amend Historic Heritage Overlay Rules as follows:  OVR1-R12 Total or <del>partial</del> demolition or relocation of an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7].  OVR1-R13: External alterations, additions, <del>total</del> or partial demolition or <del>relocation</del> to an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7]. In addition, amend OVR3-R13 to refer to <u>non</u> -contributory site.  Add the following Rule to  OVR3: <u>External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site.</u>  Amend OVR2-R14: <del>PREC3</del> OVR2-R14A	Open Submission

# OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules /OVR6-R14: External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a Non-Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.133	Amend	The submitter considers it necessary to amend the wording of the Historic Heritage Overlay Rules to remove wording inconsistencies. Specifically, amendments as follows to make the Rules logical and ordered: Amend Rule 12 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to partial demolition; Amend Rule 13 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to total demolition and relocation; There appears to be an error in OVR-R13, in which the title of OVR3-R13 should be non-contributory not contributory; In OVR3 there is no Rule managing alterations and additions of primary buildings on non-contributory sites (the equivalent Rule 14 found in OVR 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7). This may be an error which needs to be rectified; The text ‘PREC3-R14A’ appears to be an error in Overlay Area 2.	Amend Historic Heritage Overlay Rules as follows: OVR1-R12 Total or <del>partial</del> demolition or relocation of an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7].  OVR1-R13: External alterations, additions, <del>total</del> or partial demolition or <del>relocation</del> to an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7]. In addition, amend OVR3-R13 to refer to <u>non</u> -contributory site.  Add the following Rule to  OVR3: External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site.  Amend OVR2-R14: <del>PREC3</del> OVR2-R14A	Open Submission
OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay /Assessment criteria /General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.141	Amend	HNZPT is generally supportive of the assessment criteria in each Overlay. However, in relation to the HNZPT requested changes to the Historic Heritage Overlay Rules, in particular Rules 12, 13 and 14 in OVR 1-3 and OVR5-7, there will be a need for consequential amendments to the Assessment criteria.	Amend Assessment criteria to be consistent with any changes to the Rules following the HNZPT Submission Points for each Historic Heritage Overlay.	Open Submission
OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR6-P3: New buildings and structures	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.194	Support	Supports OVR6-P3: New buildings and structures as the intent of the policy is supported with its reference to ensuring that new buildings are sympathetic with existing heritage values.	Retain OVR6-P3: New buildings and structures as notified.	Open Submission
OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR6-P4: Alterations, additions, and partial demolition	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.201	Support	Supports OVR6-P4 as the intention of the policy is supported.	Retain OVR6-P4 as notified.	Open Submission
OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR6-P5: Total demolition and removal on Non-contributory sites	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.207	Support	Considers that these policies (OVR1-P6 OVR2-P5 OVR3-P5 OVR5-P5 OVR6-P5 OVR7-P5 OVR8-P6) are supported as being appropriate for non-contributory sites. The associated rule for this policy uses the term relocation rather than removal. It is preferable to use consistent terms through an amendment.	Amend Policies OVR1-P6 OVR2-P5 OVR3-P5 OVR5-P5 OVR6-P5 OVR7-P5 OVR8-P6 as follows:  Total demolition and <del>Removal</del> relocation of buildings and structures on Non-contributory sites	Open Submission
OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR6-P6: Total demolition and removal on Contributory sites	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.214	Support	Supports the use of the term ‘Avoid’ as well as the consideration of alternatives for Policies OVR1-P7 OVR2-P6 OVR3-P6 OVR4-P6 OVR5-P6 OVR6-P6 OVR7-P6 OVR8-P7.	Retain Policies OVR1-P7 OVR2-P6 OVR3-P6 OVR4-P6 OVR5-P6 OVR6-P6 OVR7-P6 OVR8-P7 pertaining to demolition of buildings on contributory sites.	Open Submission
OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR6 - Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules /OVR6-R1: Maintenance and repair of any existing building or structure on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.221	Support	HNZPT supports the Permitted activity rule for maintenance and repair.(OVR1 to OVR8 inclusive)	Retain Maintenance and repair Rules as notified.	Open Submission

# OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay - Standards Table /OVR7-S6: Fences and walls	Susan Dallas	25.12	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay - Standards Table /OVR7-S6: Fences and walls	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.12	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /	Tom Anderson	151.54	Amend	Considers that It needs to be confirmed that due to the presence of this provision, that the customer connection to heritage buildings or items as sought in this submission applies to this heritage overlay.	Seeks confirmation that due to the presence of this provision, that the customer connection to heritage buildings or items as sought in this submission applies to this heritage overlay.	Open Submission
OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.49	Amend	Council wishes to enable continued use, including solar panels, on heritage items provided that heritage values are not compromised.	Add new permitted activity rule (for both contributory and non-contributory sites):  Minor external alterations to any Group A or Group B heritage item that are associated with: i) Security alarms ii) Security lighting Any attachment that is not visible from a road or public space, excluding signage	Open Submission
OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay /Objectives /OVR7-O2: Protect and maintain historic heritage values	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.68	Support	Supports Objective OVR7-O2: Protect and maintain historic heritage values as the objective with its reference to protection and maintenance of historic heritage values of each area is supported.	Retain Objective OVR7-O2: Protect and maintain historic heritage values as notified.	Open Submission
OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR7-P2: Cumulative adverse effects	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.76	Support	Supports OVR7-P2: Cumulative adverse effects as the reference to avoiding cumulative effects to the historic heritage values of Overlay areas is supported.	Retain OVR7-P2: Cumulative adverse effects as notified.	Open Submission
OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR7-R4: External alterations, additions, and total or partial demolition to an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.91	Oppose	Opposes Rule OVR7-R4 wording as a lower level of control on the construction of new accessory buildings and alterations to existing accessory buildings is appropriate. It is noted that the proposed Rule 4 allows for the total demolition of accessory buildings as a permitted activity. Rules regarding demolition of accessory buildings (Rule 4) appears to conflict with rules regarding total demolition 'of any building or structure' (Rule 8) on Contributing sites in some overlay areas. This conflict is apparent comparing Rules 4 and 8 in Overlays 2, 4, and 7.	Retain Rules pertaining to accessory buildings on contributory sites.	Open Submission
OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR7-R5: External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.98	Support	Supports OVR7-R5: External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a Contributory site. However, Rule OVR3-R5 refers to 'accessory buildings' and is essentially a repeat of OVR3-R4 necessitating an amendment.	Retain OVR7-R5, with the exception of OVR3-R5 to be amended as follows:  External additions, alterations, and <del>total or</del> partial demolition to <u>an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a contributory site.</u>	Open Submission
OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR7-R6: New or relocated buildings or structures on a Contributory site not otherwise provided for by OVR7-R2	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.105	Support	Supports Rule OVR7-R6 and the Restricted Discretionary activity status.	Retain Rule OVR7-R6 as notified.	Open Submission
OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR7-R7: Activities infringing standards OVR7-S1-OVR7-S6 on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.113	Support	Supports OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay Rule OVR7-R7 and the Restricted Discretionary activity status.	Retain Rule OVR7-R7 as notified.	Open Submission
OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR7-R8: Total demolition or relocation off-site of a building or structure on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.116	Amend	Considers Rule OVR7-R8 requires amendment as while generally supported, it creates inconsistency with other Plan provisions. There are three examples of Rule 8 which do not refer to 'primary' buildings or structures, and this creates a conflict with Rule 4 of each of those sections. Overlays 2, 4, and 7 contain this apparent contradiction.	Amend Rules OVR2-R8, OVR4-R8, and OVR7-R8 to include wording to correct this error as follows:  Total demolition or relocation off site of a <u>primary</u> building or structure on a Contributory site	Open Submission

# OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR7-R12: Total or partial demolition, or relocation of an accessory or primary building or structure on a Non-contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.134	Amend	The submitter considers it necessary to amend the wording of the Historic Heritage Overlay Rules to remove wording inconsistencies. Specifically, amendments as follows to make the Rules logical and ordered: Amend Rule 12 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to partial demolition; Amend Rule 13 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to total demolition and relocation; There appears to be an error in OVR-R13, in which the title of OVR3-R13 should be non-contributory not contributory; In OVR3 there is no Rule managing alterations and additions of primary buildings on non-contributory sites (the equivalent Rule 14 found in OVR 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7). This may be an error which needs to be rectified; The text 'PREC3-R14A' appears to be an error in Overlay Area 2.	Amend Historic Heritage Overlay Rules as follows: OVR1-R12 Total or <del>partial</del> demolition or relocation of an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7].  OVR1-R13: External alterations, additions, <del>total</del> or partial demolition or <del>relocation</del> to an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7]. In addition, amend OVR3-R13 to refer to <u>non</u> -contributory site.  Add the following Rule to  <u>OVR3:</u> <u>External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site.</u>  Amend OVR2-R14: <del>PREC3</del> OVR2-R14A	Open Submission
OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR7-R14: External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure other than an accessory building or structure on a Non-contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.136	Amend	The submitter considers it necessary to amend the wording of the Historic Heritage Overlay Rules to remove wording inconsistencies. Specifically, amendments as follows to make the Rules logical and ordered: Amend Rule 12 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to partial demolition; Amend Rule 13 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to total demolition and relocation; There appears to be an error in OVR-R13, in which the title of OVR3-R13 should be non-contributory not contributory; In OVR3 there is no Rule managing alterations and additions of primary buildings on non-contributory sites (the equivalent Rule 14 found in OVR 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7). This may be an error which needs to be rectified; The text 'PREC3-R14A' appears to be an error in Overlay Area 2.	Amend Historic Heritage Overlay Rules as follows: OVR1-R12 Total or <del>partial</del> demolition or relocation of an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7].  OVR1-R13: External alterations, additions, <del>total</del> or partial demolition or <del>relocation</del> to an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7]. In addition, amend OVR3-R13 to refer to <u>non</u> -contributory site.  Add the following Rule to  <u>OVR3:</u> <u>External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site.</u>  Amend OVR2-R14: <del>PREC3</del> OVR2-R14A	Open Submission
OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay /Assessment criteria /General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.142	Amend	HNZPT is generally supportive of the assessment criteria in each Overlay. However, in relation to the HNZPT requested changes to the Historic Heritage Overlay Rules, in particular Rules 12, 13 and 14 in OVR 1-3 and OVR5-7, there will be a need for consequential amendments to the Assessment criteria.	Amend Assessment criteria to be consistent with any changes to the Rules following the HNZPT Submission Points for each Historic Heritage Overlay.	Open Submission



# OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR7-R13: External alterations, additions, total or partial demolition or relocation to an accessory building or structure on a Non-contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.189	Amend	The submitter considers it necessary to amend the wording of the Historic Heritage Overlay Rules to remove wording inconsistencies. Specifically, amendments as follows to make the Rules logical and ordered: Amend Rule 12 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to partial demolition; Amend Rule 13 in OVR1 – OVR3 and OVR5 – OVR7 by removing the reference to total demolition and relocation; There appears to be an error in OVR-R13, in which the title of OVR3-R13 should be non-contributory not contributory; In OVR3 there is no Rule managing alterations and additions of primary buildings on non-contributory sites (the equivalent Rule 14 found in OVR 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7). This may be an error which needs to be rectified; The text 'PREC3-R14A' appears to be an error in Overlay Area 2.	Amend Historic Heritage Overlay Rules as follows: OVR1-R12 Total or <del>partial</del> demolition or relocation of an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7].  OVR1-R13: External alterations, additions, <del>total</del> or partial demolition or <del>relocation</del> to an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site. [same amendment in OVR 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7]. In addition, amend OVR3-R13 to refer to <u>non</u> -contributory site.  Add the following Rule to  <u>OVR3:</u> <u>External additions, alterations, and partial demolition to an existing building or structure, other than an accessory building or structure on a non-contributory site.</u>  Amend OVR2-R14: <del>PREC3</del> OVR2-R14A	Open Submission
OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR7-P3: New buildings and structures	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.195	Support	Supports OVR7-P3: New buildings and structures as the intent of the policy is supported with its reference to ensuring that new buildings are sympathetic with existing heritage values.	Retain OVR7-P3: New buildings and structures as notified.	Open Submission
OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR7-P4: Alterations, additions, and partial demolition	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.202	Support	Supports OVR7-P4 as the intention of the policy is supported.	Retain OVR7-P4 as notified.	Open Submission
OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR7-P5: Total demolition and removal on Non-contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.208	Support	Considers that these policies (OVR1-P6 OVR2-P5 OVR3-P5 OVR5-P5 OVR6-P5 OVR7-P5 OVR8-P6) are supported as being appropriate for non-contributory sites. The associated rule for this policy uses the term relocation rather than removal. It is preferable to use consistent terms through an amendment.	Amend Policies OVR1-P6 OVR2-P5 OVR3-P5 OVR5-P5 OVR6-P5 OVR7-P5 OVR8-P6 as follows:  Total demolition and <del>Removal</del> -relocation of buildings and structures on Non-contributory sites	Open Submission
OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR7-P6: Total demolition and removal on Contributory sites	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.215	Support	Supports the use of the term 'Avoid' as well as the consideration of alternatives for Policies OVR1-P7 OVR2-P6 OVR3-P6 OVR4-P6 OVR5-P6 OVR6-P6 OVR7-P6 OVR8-P7.	Retain Policies OVR1-P7 OVR2-P6 OVR3-P6 OVR4-P6 OVR5-P6 OVR6-P6 OVR7-P6 OVR8-P7 pertaining to demolition of buildings on contributory sites.	Open Submission
OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR7-R1: Maintenance and repair of any existing building or structure on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.222	Support	HNZPT supports the Permitted activity rule for maintenance and repair.(OVR1 to OVR8 inclusive)	Retain Maintenance and repair Rules as notified.	Open Submission
OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay /OVR7 - Te Awa Bungalow Historic Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR7-R2: Accessory buildings and structures, not including fences and/or walls, on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.228	Amend	HNZPT considers that while R2 Overlays Rules for Ancillary / accessory buildings and structures, not including fences and walls, on a Contributory site (Overlays 1 to 7 inclusive) are supported, there is however inconsistency in OVR1-R2 over its use of the word 'Ancillary' versus 'Accessory' for the other Overlays. Accessory building is preferred, as it is a Defined term in the Plan.	Amend Rule OVR1-R2 by replacing the word <del>ancillary</del> with <u>accessory</u> .	Open Submission

# OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table	Tom Anderson	151.55	Amend	Considers that it needs to be confirmed that due to the presence of this provision, that the customer connection to heritage buildings or items as sought in this submission applies to this heritage overlay.	Seeks confirmation that due to the presence of this provision, that the customer connection to heritage buildings or items as sought in this submission applies to this heritage overlay.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R2: Partial demolition of a building or structure on a Contributory site	Cameron Drury	179.7	Amend	Support the approach of allowing limited work as a Permitted Activity but greater certainty of the view shaft from the street is required to enable effective implementation of the Rule.	Amend rule to improve clarity in implementation.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R3: External additions and alterations to buildings or structures on a Contributory site	Cameron Drury	179.8	Amend	Support the approach of allowing limited work as a Permitted Activity but greater certainty of the view shaft is required to enable effective implementation of the Rule. Further, and what constitutes the 25m2 allowed – gross floor area or vertical area of a façade (just a front façade?).	Seeks that the rule be amended to improve clarity.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R5: New or relocated buildings or structures not otherwise provided by OVR8-R4 on a Contributory site	Cameron Drury	179.9	Oppose	Greater certainty for landowners needs to be provided.	Delete rule, or alternatively amend to a Controlled activity with non-notification status so it is clear that new buildings are anticipated and enabled on sites within the overlay, however conditions may be applied in terms of design.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R6: Total demolition or relocation off site of a building or structure on a Contributory site	Cameron Drury	179.10	Oppose	Together with a non-complying activity status noting responding to Policy OVR8-P7, which sets out circumstances when demolition can occur, greater discretion is considered appropriate when considering groups of buildings as opposed to individual buildings.	Amend to a Discretionary status.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R7: Maintenance and repair of any existing building or structure on a Non-contributory site	Cameron Drury	179.11	Amend	Support the approach of allowing limited work as a Permitted Activity but greater certainty of the view shaft is required to enable effective implementation of the Rule, and what constitutes the 25m2 allowed – gross floor area or vertical area of a façade (just a front façade?) The rule/approach should be more enabling than OVR8-R3A given it applies to non-contributory sites.	Amend	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R7: Maintenance and repair of any existing building or structure on a Non-contributory site	Cameron Drury	179.12	Oppose	Greater certainty for landowners needs to be provided.	Delete rule, or alternatively amend to a Controlled activity with non-notification status so it is clear that new buildings are anticipated and enabled on sites within the overlay, however conditions may be applied in terms of design.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /Objectives /OVR8-O2: Protect and maintain heritage values of the Iron Pot Historic Heritage Overlay	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.69	Support	Supports Objective OVR8-O2: Protect and maintain heritage values of the Iron Pot Historic Heritage Overlay as the objective with its reference to protection and maintenance of historic heritage values of each area is supported.	Retain Objective OVR8-O2: Protect and maintain heritage values of the Iron Pot Historic Heritage Overlay as notified.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR8-P2: Cumulative adverse effects	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.77	Support	Supports OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay OVR8-P2: Cumulative adverse effects as the reference to avoiding cumulative effects to the historic heritage values of Overlay areas is supported.	Retain OVR8-P2: Cumulative adverse effects as notified.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R5: New or relocated buildings or structures not otherwise provided by OVR8-R4 on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.106	Support	Supports Rule OVR8-R5: New or relocated buildings or structures not otherwise provided by OVR8-R4 on a Contributory site and the Restricted Discretionary activity status.	Retain Rule OVR8-R5 as notified.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR8-P3: New buildings and structures	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.196	Support	Supports OVR8-P3: New buildings and structures as the intent of the Policy is supported with its reference to ensuring that new buildings are sympathetic with existing heritage values.	Retain OVR8-P3: New buildings and structures as notified.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR8-P4: Alterations and additions	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.203	Support	Supports OVR8-P4 as the intention of the policy is supported.	Retain OVR8-P4 as notified.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR8-P6: Total or partial demolition and removal on Non-contributory sites	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.209	Support	Considers that these policies (OVR1-P6 OVR2-P5 OVR3-P5 OVR5-P5 OVR6-P5 OVR7-P5 OVR8-P6) are supported as being appropriate for non-contributory sites. The associated rule for this policy uses the term relocation rather than removal. It is preferable to use consistent terms through an amendment.	Amend Policies OVR1-P6 OVR2-P5 OVR3-P5 OVR5-P5 OVR6-P5 OVR7-P5 OVR8-P6 as follows:  Total demolition and <del>removal</del> relocation of buildings and structures on Non-contributory sites	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR8-P7: Total demolition and removal on Contributory sites	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.216	Support	Supports the use of the term 'Avoid' as well as the consideration of alternatives for Policies OVR1-P7 OVR2-P6 OVR3-P6 OVR4-P6 OVR5-P6 OVR6-P6 OVR7-P6 OVR8-P7.	Retain Policies OVR1-P7 OVR2-P6 OVR3-P6 OVR4-P6 OVR5-P6 OVR6-P6 OVR7-P6 OVR8-P7 pertaining to demolition of buildings on contributory sites.	Open Submission

# OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table	Tom Anderson	151.55	Amend	Considers that it needs to be confirmed that due to the presence of this provision, that the customer connection to heritage buildings or items as sought in this submission applies to this heritage overlay.	Seeks confirmation that due to the presence of this provision, that the customer connection to heritage buildings or items as sought in this submission applies to this heritage overlay.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R2: Partial demolition of a building or structure on a Contributory site	Cameron Drury	179.7	Amend	Support the approach of allowing limited work as a Permitted Activity but greater certainty of the view shaft from the street is required to enable effective implementation of the Rule.	Amend rule to improve clarity in implementation.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R3: External additions and alterations to buildings or structures on a Contributory site	Cameron Drury	179.8	Amend	Support the approach of allowing limited work as a Permitted Activity but greater certainty of the view shaft is required to enable effective implementation of the Rule. Further, and what constitutes the 25m2 allowed – gross floor area or vertical area of a façade (just a front façade?).		Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R5: New or relocated buildings or structures not otherwise provided by OVR8-R4 on a Contributory site	Cameron Drury	179.9	Oppose	Greater certainty for landowners needs to be provided.	Delete rule, or alternatively amend to a Controlled activity with non-notification status so it is clear that new buildings are anticipated and enabled on sites within the overlay, however conditions may be applied in terms of design.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R6: Total demolition or relocation off site of a building or structure on a Contributory site	Cameron Drury	179.10	Oppose	Together with a non-complying activity status noting responding to Policy OVR8-P7, which sets out circumstances when demolition can occur, greater discretion is considered appropriate when considering groups of buildings as opposed to individual buildings.	Amend to a Discretionary status.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R7: Maintenance and repair of any existing building or structure on a Non-contributory site	Cameron Drury	179.11	Amend	Support the approach of allowing limited work as a Permitted Activity but greater certainty of the view shaft is required to enable effective implementation of the Rule, and what constitutes the 25m2 allowed – gross floor area or vertical area of a façade (just a front façade?) The rule/approach should be more enabling than OVR8-R3A given it applies to non-contributory sites.	Amend	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R7: Maintenance and repair of any existing building or structure on a Non-contributory site	Cameron Drury	179.12	Oppose	Greater certainty for landowners needs to be provided.	Delete rule, or alternatively amend to a Controlled activity with non-notification status so it is clear that new buildings are anticipated and enabled on sites within the overlay, however conditions may be applied in terms of design.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /Objectives /OVR8-O2: Protect and maintain heritage values of the Iron Pot Historic Heritage Overlay	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.69	Support	Supports Objective OVR8-O2: Protect and maintain heritage values of the Iron Pot Historic Heritage Overlay as the objective with its reference to protection and maintenance of historic heritage values of each area is supported.	Retain Objective OVR8-O2: Protect and maintain heritage values of the Iron Pot Historic Heritage Overlay as notified.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR8-P2: Cumulative adverse effects	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.77	Support	Supports OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay OVR8-P2: Cumulative adverse effects as the reference to avoiding cumulative effects to the historic heritage values of Overlay areas is supported.	Retain OVR8-P2: Cumulative adverse effects as notified.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R5: New or relocated buildings or structures not otherwise provided by OVR8-R4 on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.106	Support	Supports Rule OVR8-R5: New or relocated buildings or structures not otherwise provided by OVR8-R4 on a Contributory site and the Restricted Discretionary activity status.	Retain Rule OVR8-R5 as notified.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR8-P3: New buildings and structures	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.196	Support	Supports OVR8-P3: New buildings and structures as the intent of the Policy is supported with its reference to ensuring that new buildings are sympathetic with existing heritage values.	Retain OVR8-P3: New buildings and structures as notified.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR8-P4: Alterations and additions	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.203	Support	Supports OVR8-P4 as the intention of the policy is supported.	Retain OVR8-P4 as notified.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR8-P6: Total or partial demolition and removal on Non-contributory sites	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.209	Support	Considers that these policies (OVR1-P6 OVR2-P5 OVR3-P5 OVR5-P5 OVR6-P5 OVR7-P5 OVR8-P6) are supported as being appropriate for non-contributory sites. The associated rule for this policy uses the term relocation rather than removal. It is preferable to use consistent terms through an amendment.	Amend Policies OVR1-P6 OVR2-P5 OVR3-P5 OVR5-P5 OVR6-P5 OVR7-P5 OVR8-P6 as follows:  Total demolition and <del>Removal</del> relocation of buildings and structures on Non-contributory sites	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR8-P7: Total demolition and removal on Contributory sites	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.216	Support	Supports the use of the term 'Avoid' as well as the consideration of alternatives for Policies OVR1-P7 OVR2-P6 OVR3-P6 OVR4-P6 OVR5-P6 OVR6-P6 OVR7-P6 OVR8-P7.	Retain Policies OVR1-P7 OVR2-P6 OVR3-P6 OVR4-P6 OVR5-P6 OVR6-P6 OVR7-P6 OVR8-P7 pertaining to demolition of buildings on contributory sites.	Open Submission

# OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table	Tom Anderson	151.55	Amend	Considers that it needs to be confirmed that due to the presence of this provision, that the customer connection to heritage buildings or items as sought in this submission applies to this heritage overlay.	Seeks confirmation that due to the presence of this provision, that the customer connection to heritage buildings or items as sought in this submission applies to this heritage overlay.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R2: Partial demolition of a building or structure on a Contributory site	Cameron Drury	179.7	Amend	Support the approach of allowing limited work as a Permitted Activity but greater certainty of the view shaft from the street is required to enable effective implementation of the Rule.	Amend rule to improve clarity in implementation.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R3: External additions and alterations to buildings or structures on a Contributory site	Cameron Drury	179.8	Amend	Support the approach of allowing limited work as a Permitted Activity but greater certainty of the view shaft is required to enable effective implementation of the Rule. Further, and what constitutes the 25m2 allowed – gross floor area or vertical area of a façade (just a front façade?).		Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R5: New or relocated buildings or structures not otherwise provided by OVR8-R4 on a Contributory site	Cameron Drury	179.9	Oppose	Greater certainty for landowners needs to be provided.	Delete rule, or alternatively amend to a Controlled activity with non-notification status so it is clear that new buildings are anticipated and enabled on sites within the overlay, however conditions may be applied in terms of design.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R6: Total demolition or relocation off site of a building or structure on a Contributory site	Cameron Drury	179.10	Oppose	Together with a non-complying activity status noting responding to Policy OVR8-P7, which sets out circumstances when demolition can occur, greater discretion is considered appropriate when considering groups of buildings as opposed to individual buildings.	Amend to a Discretionary status.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R7: Maintenance and repair of any existing building or structure on a Non-contributory site	Cameron Drury	179.11	Amend	Support the approach of allowing limited work as a Permitted Activity but greater certainty of the view shaft is required to enable effective implementation of the Rule, and what constitutes the 25m2 allowed – gross floor area or vertical area of a façade (just a front façade?) The rule/approach should be more enabling than OVR8-R3A given it applies to non-contributory sites.	Amend	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R7: Maintenance and repair of any existing building or structure on a Non-contributory site	Cameron Drury	179.12	Oppose	Greater certainty for landowners needs to be provided.	Delete rule, or alternatively amend to a Controlled activity with non-notification status so it is clear that new buildings are anticipated and enabled on sites within the overlay, however conditions may be applied in terms of design.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /Objectives /OVR8-O2: Protect and maintain heritage values of the Iron Pot Historic Heritage Overlay	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.69	Support	Supports Objective OVR8-O2: Protect and maintain heritage values of the Iron Pot Historic Heritage Overlay as the objective with its reference to protection and maintenance of historic heritage values of each area is supported.	Retain Objective OVR8-O2: Protect and maintain heritage values of the Iron Pot Historic Heritage Overlay as notified.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR8-P2: Cumulative adverse effects	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.77	Support	Supports OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay OVR8-P2: Cumulative adverse effects as the reference to avoiding cumulative effects to the historic heritage values of Overlay areas is supported.	Retain OVR8-P2: Cumulative adverse effects as notified.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R5: New or relocated buildings or structures not otherwise provided by OVR8-R4 on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.106	Support	Supports Rule OVR8-R5: New or relocated buildings or structures not otherwise provided by OVR8-R4 on a Contributory site and the Restricted Discretionary activity status.	Retain Rule OVR8-R5 as notified.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR8-P3: New buildings and structures	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.196	Support	Supports OVR8-P3: New buildings and structures as the intent of the Policy is supported with its reference to ensuring that new buildings are sympathetic with existing heritage values.	Retain OVR8-P3: New buildings and structures as notified.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR8-P4: Alterations and additions	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.203	Support	Supports OVR8-P4 as the intention of the policy is supported.	Retain OVR8-P4 as notified.	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR8-P6: Total or partial demolition and removal on Non-contributory sites	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.209	Support	Considers that these policies (OVR1-P6 OVR2-P5 OVR3-P5 OVR5-P5 OVR6-P5 OVR7-P5 OVR8-P6) are supported as being appropriate for non-contributory sites. The associated rule for this policy uses the term relocation rather than removal. It is preferable to use consistent terms through an amendment.	Amend Policies OVR1-P6 OVR2-P5 OVR3-P5 OVR5-P5 OVR6-P5 OVR7-P5 OVR8-P6 as follows:  Total demolition and <del>Removal</del> relocation of buildings and structures on Non-contributory sites	Open Submission
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /Policies /OVR8-P7: Total demolition and removal on Contributory sites	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.216	Support	Supports the use of the term 'Avoid' as well as the consideration of alternatives for Policies OVR1-P7 OVR2-P6 OVR3-P6 OVR4-P6 OVR5-P6 OVR6-P6 OVR7-P6 OVR8-P7.	Retain Policies OVR1-P7 OVR2-P6 OVR3-P6 OVR4-P6 OVR5-P6 OVR6-P6 OVR7-P6 OVR8-P7 pertaining to demolition of buildings on contributory sites.	Open Submission

# OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R1: Maintenance and repair of any existing building or structure on a Contributory site	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.223	Support	HNZPT supports the Permitted activity rule for maintenance and repair.  (OVR1 to OVR8 inclusive)	Retain Maintenance and repair Rules as notified.	Open Submission

# ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity /ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity /	Lynne Anderson	96.1	Amend	Considers that mention of the Indigenous Biodiversity Plan Variation should be amended to reference support for the NPS - Indigenous Biodiversity ("NPS-IB") in relation to banded dotterel and the desirability of a part of Napier's coastline as a Significant Natural Area ("SNA") with the addition of greater Bylaw / enforcement for all of Napier's coastline.	Amend ECO - Ecosystem and Indigenous Biodiversity, Indigenous Biodiversity Plan Variation to reference support for the gazetted NPS - Indigenous Biodiversity ("NPS-IB") 2023 in relation to banded dotterel as Threatened or At Risk species in Appendix 2: Specified Highly Mobile Fauna and the desirability of a part of Napier's coastline as a Significant Natural Area ("SNA") with the addition of objectives, policies, methods for the protection, maintenance and enhancement of SNAs to avoid certain effects as set out in the NPS-IB. As well as greater Bylaw / enforcement for all of Napier's coastline.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity /ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity /	Rebecca Eng	99.58	Support	Transpower supports a variation to the PDP in relation to Indigenous Biodiversity, noting the NPS-IB does not apply to electricity transmission. Transpower notes the submission points made in the balance of this submission have been made without the benefit of the Indigenous Biodiversity provisions and therefore Transpower reserves its position on the lodged submission points in so far as they relate to Indigenous Biodiversity.	Seeks to ensure submitters have the ability to update other submission points in so far as they are relevant to ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity.	Open Submission
ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity /ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity /	Trevor Ellis	253.2	Amend	As the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter has been delayed, the matters of control, discretion, and assessment criteria for rules in the plan should include effects on indigenous biodiversity where the activity will involve being in, or adjacent to, indigenous biodiversity to protect it in the interim.	Amend the appropriate rules to include effects on indigenous biodiversity in their matters of control, matters of discretion, and assessment criteria.	Open Submission
ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity /ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity /	Nichola Nicholson	264.13	Amend	Considers the ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity chapter essential to the PDP. The loss and decline of indigenous biodiversity are a significant issue in Napier and should be addressed through appropriate plan provisions.	Inclusion of objectives, policies, and rules to manage indigenous biodiversity in Napier.	Open Submission
ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity /ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity /	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.1	Amend	Forest & Bird considers it to be essential that the proposed chapter on Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity is notified before hearings on other related parts of the District Plan take place. This will enable the Hearing Panel to understand the Council's overall position, to ensure that the plan is internally consistent and integrated, and to ensure that the entire plan properly implements national and regional policy instruments. Is concerned that the Council's staged approach to notification could result in this chapter not being properly integrated into other parts of the plan. The plan as currently notified should clearly state that all activities with adverse effects on indigenous species, habitats and biodiversity must be avoided, remedied, or mitigated in accordance with the provisions of the ECO chapter. Concerned about the protection of ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity during the period prior to notification of the ECO chapter, in circumstances where the Council will be relying on the ECO chapter to give effect to national and regional policy statements.	Seeks to ensure that all activities with adverse effects on natural environment values must be avoided, remedied or mitigated in accordance with the provisions of the ECO chapter.  Seeks to include strategic objectives giving effect to s 6(a) to 6(d) of the Act, the NPS-FM, NPS-IB, and the Regional Policy Statement (currently contained in the Hawke's Bay Regional Resource Management Plan)	Open Submission
ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity /ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity /	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.79	Amend	Concerned that provisions within the currently notified plan may be inconsistent with achieving the objectives of the Ecosystems and Biodiversity chapter (refer provision below).The provisions relating to Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity have not been included in the Proposed District Plan and will be released at a later date as a variation.	Seeks to ensure that the scope of the variation of the ECO chapter provisions includes the SD chapters and the Infrastructure chapters so that submission can be made on those chapters with respect to Ecosystems and Biodiversity.	Open Submission
ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity /ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity /	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.179	Amend	Seeks a reference in each of the area -specific chapters that the provisions of the ECO chapter apply.	Include a reference in each of the area -specific chapters that the provisions of the ECO chapter apply.	Open Submission

# NFL - Natural Features and Landscape

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape //	Rebecca Eng	99.87	Amend	Seeks clarification as to whether the Natural Features and Landscapes provisions are applicable to the Network Utilities provisions. Based on the introductory text of the Network Utilities chapter, it is assumed that the NFL chapter does not apply. Policy NU-P3 applies to outstanding natural features and significant landscapes, and high natural character areas and significant amenity features. Notwithstanding some of these terms are not defined, the intent is that the Network Utilities chapter provide the policy consideration for effects on Natural Features and Landscapes. Specific to the National Grid, policy NU-P6 provides a specific 'seek to avoid' policy approach in respect of development of the National Grid.	Clarify the relationship between the chapters, and rely solely on the Network Utilities chapter to manage network utilities. The applicability of the objectives and policies of the NFL chapter to the Network Utilities chapter also requires clarification.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /Policies /NFL-P1: Identification of outstanding natural features, special character landscapes, and special character features	Rebecca Eng	99.88	Support	Supports the identification and mapping of the areas.	Retain the policy.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /Policies /NFL-P2: Protection of Ōtātara as an outstanding natural feature	Rebecca Eng	99.89	Amend	Clarification is sought on the relationship between the NFL chapter and the NU chapter. Based on the introductory text to the Network Utilities chapter, it is assumed the rules in the Natural Features and Landscapes ('NFL') chapter do not apply. Applicability of the objectives and policies of the NFL chapter also requires clarification. It is noted that policy NU-P3 applies to outstanding natural features and significant landscapes, and high natural character areas and significant amenity features. Notwithstanding some of these terms are not defined, the intent is that the Network Utilities chapter provide the policy consideration for effects on Natural Features and Landscapes. Specific to the National Grid, policy NU-P6 provides a specific 'seek to avoid' policy approach in respect of development of the National Grid. Should policy NLF-P2 apply to the National Grid, Transpower seeks amendment to the policy to give effect to the 'seek to avoid' policy directive in NPSET Policy 8.	Should policy NLF-P2 apply to the National Grid, Transpower seeks amendment to the policy to give effect to the 'seek to avoid' policy directive in NPSET Policy 8. Potential wording is provided in NU-P6 as sought to be amended through this submission.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /Policies /NFL-P3: Protection of special character features	Rebecca Eng	99.90	Amend	Clarification is sought on the relationship between the NFL chapter and the NU chapter. Based on the introductory text to the Network Utilities chapter, it is assumed the rules in the Natural Features and Landscapes ('NFL') chapter do not apply. Applicability of the objectives and policies of the NFL chapter also requires clarification. It is noted that policy NU-P3 applies to outstanding natural features and significant landscapes, and high natural character areas and significant amenity features. Notwithstanding some of these terms are not defined, the intent is that the Network Utilities chapter provide the policy consideration for effects on Natural Features and Landscapes. Specific to the National Grid, policy NU-P6 provides a specific 'seek to avoid' policy approach in respect of development of the National Grid. Should policy NLF-P3 apply to the National Grid, Transpower seeks amendment to the policy to give effect to the 'seek to avoid' policy directive in NPSET Policy 8. Potential wording is provided in NU-P6 as sought to be amended through this submission.	Should policy NLF-P3 apply to the National Grid, Transpower seeks amendment to the policy to give effect to the 'seek to avoid' policy directive in NPSET Policy 8. Potential wording is provided in NU-P6 as sought to be amended through this submission.	Open Submission

# NFL - Natural Features and Landscape

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /Policies /NFL-P4: Protection of special character landscapes	Rebecca Eng	99.91	Amend	Clarification is sought on the relationship between the NFL chapter and the NU chapter. Based on the introductory text to the Network Utilities chapter, it is assumed the rules in the Natural Features and Landscapes ('NFL') chapter do not apply. Applicability of the objectives and policies of the NFL chapter also requires clarification. It is noted that policy NU-P3 applies to outstanding natural features and significant landscapes, and high natural character areas and significant amenity features. Notwithstanding some of these terms are not defined, the intent is that the Network Utilities chapter provide the policy consideration for effects on Natural Features and Landscapes. Specific to the National Grid, policy NU-P6 provides a specific 'seek to avoid' policy approach in respect of development of the National Grid. Should policy NLF-P4 apply to the National Grid, Transpower seeks amendment to the policy to give effect to the 'seek to avoid' policy directive in NPSET Policy 8. Potential wording is provided in NU-P6 as sought to be amended through this submission.	Should policy NLF-P4 apply to the National Grid, Transpower seeks amendment to the policy to give effect to the 'seek to avoid' policy directive in NPSET Policy 8. Potential wording is provided in NU-P6 as sought to be amended through this submission. The policy title of NFL-P4 requires amendment to replace 'protection' with 'minimise' to more correctly articulate the policy wording.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /Policies /NFL-P7: Manage the effects of network utilities	Rebecca Eng	99.92	Oppose	Clarification is sought on the relationship between the NFL chapter and the NU chapter. Based on the introductory text to the Network Utilities chapter, it is assumed the rules in the Natural Features and Landscapes ('NFL') chapter do not apply. Applicability of the objectives and policies of the NFL chapter also requires clarification. It is noted that policy NU-P3 applies to outstanding natural features and significant landscapes, and high natural character areas and significant amenity features. Notwithstanding some of these terms are not defined, the intent is that the Network Utilities chapter provide the policy consideration for effects on Natural Features and Landscapes. Specific to the National Grid, policy NU-P6 provides a specific 'seek to avoid' policy approach in respect of development of the National Grid. Transpower seeks deletion of NFL-P7. Should policy NLF-P7 be retained or apply to the National Grid, Transpower seeks amendment to the policy to give effect to the 'seek to avoid' policy directive in NPSET Policy 8. The directive "avoid" wording within NFL-P7 does not give effect to the NPSET. Potential wording is provided in NU-P6 as sought to be amended through this submission.	Delete NFL-P7. Should policy NLF-P7 be retained or apply to the National Grid, Transpower seeks amendment to the policy to give effect to the 'seek to avoid' policy directive in NPSET Policy 8. The directive "avoid" wording within NFL-P7 does not give effect to the NPSET. Potential wording is provided in NU-P6 as sought to be amended through this submission.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes - Rules Table	Rebecca Eng	99.93	Amend	The relationship and applicability between the NFL chapter and the NU chapter is required. Based on the introductory text to the NU chapter, it is assumed that the rules of the NFL chapter to not apply. If this is not the case, this requires clarification as this is potentially contradictory to the above statement in the NFL chapter.	Amend the introductory text to the NFL rules as follows:  All rules apply throughout the city and are in addition to the specific zone, precinct, overlay, and district-wide rules unless otherwise stated. <u>However the rules do not apply to Network Utilities. Instead Network Utilities are managed under the Network Utilities Chapter.</u>	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes - Rules Table /NFL-R2: Buildings or structures within an outstanding natural feature and special character feature	Rebecca Eng	99.94	Oppose	Based on the introductory text of the NU chapter, it is assumed that the NFL chapter does not apply to the NU chapter. If this is not the case, this requires clarification. Should Rule NLF-R2 apply to the National Grid, Transpower seeks amendment to the rule on the basis a non complying activity status for the development of the National Grid does not give effect to the NPSET.	Should Rule NLF-R2 apply to the National Grid, Transpower seeks amendment to the rule on the basis a non complying activity status for the development of the National Grid does not give effect to the NPSET.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes - Rules Table /NFL-R3: Buildings or structures within a special character landscape (excluding the Special Purpose Airport Zone)	Rebecca Eng	99.95	Support	Based on the introductory text to the Network Utilities chapter, it is assumed the rules in the Natural Features and Landscapes ('NFL') chapter do not apply. If this is not the case, this requires clarification. Should Rule NLF-R3 apply to the National Grid, Transpower accepts the default restricted discretionary activity status.	Should Rule NLF-R3 apply to the National Grid, Transpower accepts the default restricted discretionary activity status.	Open Submission



# NFL - Natural Features and Landscape

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /Assessment criteria /NFL-AC2: Buildings or structures within an outstanding natural feature and special character feature (NFL-R1); Buildings or structures within a special character landscape (NFL-R2)Visual impact and landscape values	Rebecca Eng	99.96	Amend	Based on the introductory text to the Network Utilities chapter, it is assumed the rules in the Natural Features and Landscapes ('NFL') chapter do not apply. If this is not the case, this requires clarification. Based on the above, should the NFL chapter apply to the National Grid, Transpower seeks amendment to the assessment criteria to include operational or functional need.	Amend NFL-AC2 as follows:  NFL-AC2: Buildings or structures within an outstanding natural feature and special character feature (NFL-R1); Buildings or structures within a special character landscape (NFL-R2)  Visual impact and landscape values a. The extent to which the location, scale, height, design, external appearance, and overall form of the building or structure is appropriate to the landscape context. b. Whether the colours and material used for roofs, walls, and windows are of low reflectivity and integrate with the surrounding landscape. c. Whether there are any practical alternatives to the location of the building <u>or structure, and any operational or functional needs.</u> d. Whether building design and appearance are appropriate, taking into account the vulnerability of the landscape to accommodate change. e. The scale of modification to the landscape, including any indigenous vegetation removal. f. Whether access roads, utilities (power, phone, pipe work, and water tanks) are appropriately designed and sited to reduce their visibility. g. The extent to which landscape design is able to provide a visual buffer to mitigate any visual impact of the building or structure.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape //	Sera Chambers	150.111	Support	supports the protection of Napier's natural features and landscapes.	retain provision in current form.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /Policies	Tom Anderson	151.56	Amend	Considers that recognition of functional and operational need should be provided in the policy. A similar policy should be included in the NU Chapter of the PDP.	Move the policy to the NU chapter and amend it as follows:  Avoid locating network utilities on prominent positions and/or ridgelines within outstanding natural features and special character features, <u>while considering any functional needs or operational needs of the network utility.</u>  Mitigate the adverse effects of network utilities on special character landscapes, <u>while considering any functional needs or operational needs of the network utility.</u>  Relates to NFL-O2 and NFL-O3.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes - Rules Table /NFL-R1A	Tom Anderson	151.57	Amend	Considers that an allowance for trenching, which typically is narrow and is cut and covered in a short (day or two) period of time should be included in the rule as adverse effects are temporary. This should be included in the NU Chapter.	Amend the rule as follows and include it in the NU chapter  NFL-R1A  Activity Status: Permitted  Where:  1. The maximum amount of earthworks, <u>excluding any trenching</u> in any 12-month period does not exceed 50 m3 per site; 2. A maximum cut and fill height of 2 m, and 3. Compliance with all other earthworks permitted activity standards EW-S3 - EW-S7.	Open Submission

# NFL - Natural Features and Landscape

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes - Rules Table /NFL-R2A	Tom Anderson	151.58	Amend	Considers that telecommunication structures in such landscapes, given their slimline nature as well as their functional and operational needs (including compliance with radiofrequency standards) should be higher than 3m. Notes that 8m is permitted in Queenstown Lakes District Council's Outstanding Natural Landscapes.	Amend the rule as follows and place it in the NU chapter:  NFL-R2A  Activity Status: Permitted  Where:  1. No part of a building or structure: a. exceeds 3 m in height ( <u>except for telecommunication structures, which can be 8m in height</u> ); ...	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes - Rules Table /NFL-R3: Buildings or structures within a special character landscape (excluding the Special Purpose Airport Zone)	Tom Anderson	151.59	Amend	Considers that telecommunication structures in such landscapes, given their slimline nature as well as their functional and operational needs (including compliance with radiofrequency standards) should be higher than 3m. Notes that 8m is permitted in Queenstown Lakes District Council's Outstanding Natural Landscapes.	Amend the rule as follows and place it in the NU chapter:  NFL-R3A  Activity Status: Permitted  Where:  1. No part of a building or structure: a. exceeds 3 m in height ( <u>except for telecommunication structures, which can be 8m in height</u> ); ...	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /Policies /NFL-P7: Manage the effects of network utilities	Sheena McGuire	168.65	Amend	Notes that the Network Utilities chapter does not provide specific rules for activities within overlays. The Special Character Features (Keteketerau, Ahuriri Estuary (including outfall channel)) Overlay and the Special Character Landscapes (Te Whanganui-ā-Orotu) both extend over part of the rail network. If these overlays related to ecological values only, submitter requests the overlays be removed from the long-established, developed rail corridor. However, as the two overlays are defined by natural and historical characteristics, submitter accepts the overlays but asks for provisions which ensure rail corridor activities within the existing rail corridor are still provided for. Seeks amendment to this policy to provide an assessment hierarchy where when adverse effects cannot be avoided, adverse effects are remedied or mitigated. Due to the linear nature of the existing rail corridor, it is not always possible or practicable to relocate or avoid mapped areas. Seek recognition of this in this policy.	Amend as follows:  Manage the effects of network utilities  Avoid locating network utilities on prominent positions and/or ridgelines within outstanding natural features <del>and special character features.</del>  <u>Avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of network utilities on special character landscapes and special character features.</u>	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes - Rules Table /NFL-R1: Earthworks or land disturbance within a special character landscape (excluding the Special Purpose Airport Zone)	Sheena McGuire	168.66	Amend	Supports the Permitted Activity status of earthworks within a special character landscape, subject to standards. Seeks inclusion of two matters of discretion to recognise the importance and needs of network utilities if standards cannot be met.	Amend as follows:  NFL-R1B  Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: Restricted Discretionary  Matters of discretion are:  1. Landscape values; 2. Cultural values, 3. Sediment and erosion control, 4. <u>The functional and operational requirements of the network utility; and</u> 5. <u>Impact on the safe and efficient operation of the network utility.</u>	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes - Rules Table /NFL-R2: Buildings or structures within an outstanding natural feature and special character feature	Sheena McGuire	168.67	Amend	Accepts the rule as proposed for Outstanding Natural Features but seeks amendment to remove special character feature from this rule and to instead group with special character landscapes in NFL-R3.	Amend as follows:  NFL-R2: Buildings or structures within an outstanding natural feature <del>and special character feature</del>	Open Submission

# NFL - Natural Features and Landscape

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes - Rules Table /NFL-R3: Buildings or structures within a special character landscape (excluding the Special Purpose Airport Zone)	Sheena McGuire	168.68	Amend	Seeks amendment to include special character features within this rule which allows for buildings or structures that cannot meet Permitted Activity standards, as a Restricted Discretionary Activity. Seeks matters of discretion to recognise the importance and needs of network utilities if standards cannot be met.	Amend as follows:  NFL-R3: Buildings or structures within a special character landscape <u>or special character feature</u> (excluding the Special Purpose Airport Zone)  Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: Restricted Discretionary  Matters of discretion are:  1. Visual impact;  2. Landscape values  3. Cultural values,  4. <u>The functional and operational requirements of the network utility; and</u>  5. <u>Impact on the safe and efficient operation of the network utility.</u>	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape //	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.32	Support	The specific provisions of the proposal that this submission relates to is Te Whanganui-ā-Orotu Special Character Landscape overlay. The Joint Committee supports the proposed provisions of the special character landscape overlay as they provide a clear management framework for minimising effects on the cultural landscape that includes the Site.	Retain the landscape overlay provisions.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /Assessment criteria /NFL-AC2: Buildings or structures within an outstanding natural feature and special character feature (NFL-R1); Buildings or structures within a special character landscape (NFL-R2)	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.33	Amend	The specific provisions of the proposal this submission relates to is Te Whanganui-ā-Orotu Special Character Landscape overlay. The View shafts control area shown on the planning maps currently only has rules within the Airport Zone. Any new building or structure within the View Shaft Control Area within that zone requires resource consent with an assessment of visual amenity and landscape effects. We understand the control is shown over the subject site to demonstrate the wider context of the view corridors. However, there are no controls that apply within the Ahuriri Regional Park site itself. We suggest that any building triggering a resource consent under the Special Character Landscape provisions should be assessed having regard to the potential impacts on identified View Shafts, through an additional assessment criteria.	Amend the assessment criteria in the landscape overlay to require consideration of effects on identified View Shafts for any building or structure requiring resource consent (NFL-AC2).	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes - Rules Table /NFL-R2: Buildings or structures within an outstanding natural feature and special character feature	Angela McFlynn	189.28	Amend	Considers that no provision is made in NFL-R2: Buildings or structures within an outstanding natural feature and special character feature for the use of natural / unpainted materials in buildings.	Amend NFL-R2: Buildings or structures within an outstanding natural feature and special character feature to allow for the use of natural materials.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes - Rules Table /NFL-R3: Buildings or structures within a special character landscape (excluding the Special Purpose Airport Zone).	Angela McFlynn	189.29	Amend	The submitter considers that Clause b. of this Rule as written would require resource consent as a Restricted Discretionary activity for any building containing windows or using natural, unpainted, materials.	Amend NFL-R3:  Buildings or structures within a special character landscape (excluding the Special Purpose Airport Zone) to provide for windows in buildings as a permitted activity, and the use of unpainted materials that meet the reflectance value. Also amend wording to clarify the requirement that no part of a building has a reflectance value <del>no</del> greater than 30%.	Open Submission

# NFL - Natural Features and Landscape

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape / Introduction	Ellen Robotham	198.40	Amend	Considers it is appropriate that maintenance of the Te Whanganui ā Orotu Special Character Landscape is provided for within the unique context of the Airport Zone. Amendment is required to ensure consistency between the AIRPZ Airport chapter and NFL chapter so there is clear understanding about provisions which apply in the Airport Zone.	Amend as follows: <del>The provisions that relate to Special Character Landscapes do not apply within the Special Purpose Airport Zone. The Airport Zone is located within a Special Landscape Character Overlay, however the provisions of the Natural Features and Landscape chapter do not apply within the Airport Zone. The Special Purpose Airport Zone- protects the natural and cultural values of these landscapes and features while recognising the operational and functional requirements of the Airport by identifying View Shafts Control Areas and Landscape Sensitive Control Areas.</del>	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes - Rules Table /NFL-R1: Earthworks or land disturbance within a special character landscape (excluding the Special Purpose Airport Zone)	Ellen Robotham	198.41	Support	Considers it is appropriate that maintenance of the Te Whanganui ā Orotu Special Character Landscape is provided for within the unique context of the Airport Zone.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes - Rules Table /NFL-R3: Buildings or structures within a special character landscape (excluding the Special Purpose Airport Zone)	Ellen Robotham	198.42	Support	Considers it is appropriate that maintenance of the Te Whanganui ā Orotu Special Character Landscape is provided for within the unique context of the Airport Zone.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes /General	Trevor Ellis	253.46	Amend	Considers that references to Schedule 7 are incorrect as Schedule 2 lists the Natural Features and Landscapes.	Seeks to amend all references from Schedule 7 to Schedule 2.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes /General	Trevor Ellis	253.47	Amend	Considers that several of the sites, specifically the Ahuriri estuary have ecological values that are important to their character besides just being habitats for significant indigenous and migratory species. Flora should be protected on its own to ensure proper ecosystem functioning. There should be a greater emphasis on protection of indigenous biodiversity found at the features or landscapes.	Seeks to amend the NFL chapter to include the importance of indigenous biodiversity on natural character features and landscapes.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /Objectives /NFL-O3: Protection of special character landscapes	Trevor Ellis	253.48	Amend	Considers that NFL-O3 should set a higher initial standard to protect special character landscapes. Degradation of special character should be avoided first before mitigation to best preserve the character of the landscape. Including the terms 'avoiding' and 'remedying' will assist in ensuring that the RMA is given effect to in resource consent applications.	Seeks to amend NFL-O3 as follows or with similar wording: NFL-O3: Protection of special character landscapes  Protect the unique features by <u>avoiding, remedying, or</u> mitigating the adverse effects of subdivision, land use, and development on the natural and historical characteristics and visual qualities of Napier's special character landscapes identified in Schedule 27.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /Policies /NFL-P6: Avoid extractive industries	Trevor Ellis	253.49	Support	Considers that NFL-P6 gives effect to the Act.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes - Rules Table /NFL-R4: Vehicle parking areas to provide public access to outstanding natural features and special character features	Trevor Ellis	253.50	Oppose	Considers that matters of control should be expanded to include ecological values and amenity. Part of the reason special character features have been defined as such is because of the ecological values on the sites. Without providing for control over the ecological values, significant cultural and landscape, the special character features may be adversely affected and thus degraded.	Seeks to amend wording as follows: Matters of control: 1. Location of vehicle parking areas; 2. Safe, connected, and efficient transport network; 3. Compliance with the Transport chapter; 4. Landscape values, <del>and</del> ; 5. Cultural values; 6. <u>Ecological values, and</u> 7. <u>Amenity values</u>	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /General /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.80	Amend	Considers the s32 report notes that the Council commissioned a Landscape Assessment Study from Isthmus. Forest & Bird has been unable to locate that Study on the Council website. Forest & Bird notes that the Plan does not include any ONLs, and only one ONF. If the Isthmus Study identified any further outstanding areas, these should be included in the plan.	Seeks to include any ONLs and ONFs identified in the Isthmus Study in the plan, that have not been already carried through to the plan.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /Objectives /NFL-O1: Protection of Ōtātara as an outstanding natural feature	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.82	Support	Supports the approach of identifying outstanding and special landscapes and features, and applying a regulatory approach to ensure their protection.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission

# NFL - Natural Features and Landscape

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /Objectives /NFL-O2: Protection of special character features	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.83	Amend	Supports the identification and protection of special character features in the plan, along with a regulatory approach to support that. Also seeks that the provisions ensure that the NZCPS is given effect to. Currently the provisions do not clearly achieve that. We have sought changes to the policies below to reflect that, but Council should consider also reflecting this in the objectives.	Amend as follows:  The natural and historical characteristics and visual qualities of Napier's special character features and landscapes identified in Schedule 7 are protected from inappropriate subdivision, land use, and development.  Include specific reference to SCLs and SCFs that are in the coastal environment, either here or in a separate objective.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /Objectives /NFL-O3: Protection of special character landscapes	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.84	Amend	Considers in many circumstances, 'mitigating' effects will not be sufficient in order to achieve protection. Further, there are SCLs in the coastal environment. These must be protected by avoiding significant adverse effects (NZCPS policy 15(b)). 'Mitigation' does not reflect that requirement. Finally, certain activities are prohibited in special character landscapes. Forest & Bird supports that. However, the policy basis for prohibited activity status is not provided by only requiring mitigation.	Amend as follows:  "Protect the unique features by <u>avoiding, remedying or</u> mitigating the adverse effects..."  Include specific reference to SCLs that are in the coastal environment, either here or in a separate objective.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /Policies /NFL-P1: Identification of outstanding natural features, special character landscapes, and special character features	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.85	Support	Supports the approach of identifying outstanding and special landscapes and features, and applying a regulatory approach to ensure their protection.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /Policies /NFL-P2: Protection of Ōtātara as an outstanding natural feature	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.86	Support	Support the policy approach to protection of the ONF.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /Policies /NFL-P4: Protection of special character landscapes	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.87	Amend	Considers minimising adverse effects is not an appropriate end point for effects management. Minimised effects still need to be managed. It also does not give effect to the direction in O3, which is to protect the SCLs. Further, the policy does not give effect to NZCPS policy 15.	Amend as follows:  <del>Minimise</del> <u>Protect special character landscapes by managing</u> the effects of development within Napier's special character landscapes by:  a. limiting the scale of earthworks, managing building sizes, colours, and plantation forestry; <u>and</u>  b. <u>avoiding, remedying and mitigating the effects of those activities; and</u>  c. <u>in the Coastal Environment,avoiding significant adverse effects on the special character landscapes.</u>	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /Policies /NFL-P5: Protection of outstanding natural features, special character landscapes, and special character features in future rezoning, structure plans, and subdivisions	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.88	Amend	Considers SUB-R4 does not appear to provide for protection of SCLs. The correct reference appears to be SUB-R7. Further, mitigation is not sufficient. SCLs are meant to be protected in the plan. Further, the policy does not give effect to NZCPS policy 15.	Amend as follows:  Protect Napier's outstanding natural features, special character landscapes, and features by:  a. requiring any future rezoning and/or structure plans within landscape overlays to comply with requirements for protecting the landscape values identified in Schedule 7, and  b. requiring any subdivisions under rule SUB-R47and SUB-R6 within landscape overlays to <u>avoid,remedy or mitigate</u> potential effects on the landscape values identified in Schedule 7; and  c. <u>in the Coastal Environment,avoiding significant adverse effects on the special character landscapes.</u>	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /Policies /NFL-P6: Avoid extractive industries	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.89	Amend	Considers this policy should extend to SCLs. This would implement the direction in the objective to protect the SCLs. It would also give effect to the direction of the NZCPS, for those SCLs in the CE.	Amend as follows:  Avoid extractive industries (quarrying and mining) within or in the vicinity of outstanding natural features, <u>special character landscapes</u> and special character features.	Open Submission

# NFL - Natural Features and Landscape

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /Policies /NFL-P7: Manage the effects of network utilities	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.90	Amend	Strongly support the direction to avoid locating network utilities in ONFs and SCFs, however, this is weakened by the qualification.Further, for SCLs, mitigation is not sufficient. These landscapes are meant to be protected.Further, the policy does not give effect to NZCPS policy 15.	Amend as follows:  Avoid locating network utilities:  a. <del>on prominent positions and/or ridgelines</del> within outstanding natural features and special character features, and  <u>b. on prominent positions and/or ridgelines withinspecial character landscapes; and</u>  <u>c. anywhere in special character landscapes in theCoastal Environment.</u>  <del>Mitigate the adverse effects of network utilities onspecial character landscapes.</del>	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /General /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.91	Amend	Considers amending the Whole chapter, including Introduction, Objectives, Policies and RulesArising from late notification of ECO-chapter	Seeks to Add:  “The Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter includes provisions which relate to natural features and landscapes. Where there is a conflict between the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter and the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter, the provisions that place greater or additional restrictions on activities with adverse effects on natural environments will apply”.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes - Rules Table /NFL-R1: Earthworks or land disturbance within a special character landscape (excluding the Special Purpose Airport Zone)	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.92	Amend	Considers permitted activity status for earthworks in the coastal environment is unlikely to ensure that significant adverse effects are avoided.Further, does not support the preclusion from notification. An activity not meeting the permitted standards could cause adverse effects such that public participation is warranted.	Amend NFL-R1A as follows:  a. The maximum amount of earthworks in any 12- month period does not exceed 50 m3 per site;  b. A maximum cut and fill height of 2 m, and  c. Compliance with all other earthworks permitted activity standards EW-S3 - EW-S7; and  <u>d. the activity is outside the Coastal Environment.</u>  Delete the ‘Notification status’ note from NFL-R1B.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes - Rules Table /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.93	Amend	Considers there does not appear to be any restriction on earthworks within the ONF or SCFs, as NFL-R1 only applies to SDLs.This is contrary to the objectives and policies of the NFL chapter, and also to NZCPS policy 15.	Seeks a new rule, making earthworks in the ONF or SCFs non-complying.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes - Rules Table /NFL-R2: Buildings or structures within an outstanding natural feature and special character feature	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.94	Amend	Considers It is not clear that a 3m tall building, albeit a small one, will avoid adverse effects in the ONF or SCFs.The rule could require that buildings are not on prominent positions and/or ridgelines. However, this is not a very clear standard. Alternatively, this could be controlled activity, with control reserved over the location of the building.	Seeks to make this activity controlled, with control reserved over the location of the building.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes - Rules Table /NFL-R3: Buildings or structures within a special character landscape (excluding the Special Purpose Airport Zone)	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.95	Amend	Considers permitted activity status for buildings up to 300m2 in the coastal environment is unlikely to ensure that significant adverse effects are avoided.Further, we do not support the preclusion from notification. An activity not meeting the permitted standards could cause adverse effects such that public participation is warranted.	Seeks to Include the following standard in NFL-R3A:  <u>e.the building is not in the Coastal Environment.</u>  Delete the ‘Notification status’ note from NFL-R3B.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes - Rules Table /NFL-R4: Vehicle parking areas to provide public access to outstanding natural features and special character features	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.96	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission

# NFL - Natural Features and Landscape

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes - Rules Table /NFL-R5: Land use activities allowed for in a management plan required under the Reserves Act 1977 within an outstanding natural feature and special character feature	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.97	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes - Rules Table /NFL-R6: Plantation forestry within a special character landscape (excluding the Special Purpose Airport Zone)	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.98	Support	Considers this is appropriate, provided that there is adequate policy direction to manage effects appropriately. However, in the coastal environment this activity should be non-complying, in order to avoid significant adverse effects, in accordance with the NZCPS.	Seeks to retain, and ensure the policy is amended in line with above submission points. Make the activity non-complying in the Coastal Environment.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes - Rules Table /NFL-R7: Quarrying or mining activities within a special character landscape (excluding the Special Purpose Airport Zone)	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.99	Support	Considers this is appropriate, provided that there is adequate policy direction to manage effects appropriately. However, in the coastal environment this activity should be prohibited, in order to avoid significant adverse effects, in accordance with the NZCPS.	Seeks to retain, and ensure the policy is amended in line with above submission points. Make the activity non-complying in the Coastal Environment.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes - Rules Table /NFL-R8: Quarrying or mining activities within an outstanding natural feature and special character feature	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.100	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes - Rules Table /NFL-R9: Plantation forestry within an outstanding natural feature and special character feature	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.101	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /Assessment criteria /NFL- AC1: Earthworks in NFL areas (NFL-R1 to NFL-R3)	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.102	Amend	Considers The reference to the rules is incorrect. Only NFL-R1 manages earthworks. The criteria need to clearly direct the decision maker to consider the effects in the coastal environment. There also needs to be direction to consider avoiding, remedying and mitigating effects everywhere.	Amend to correctly cross-reference rules.  Include the following new criterion under Landscape values:  <u>The extent to which significant adverse effects in the coastal environment are avoided, and other effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u>  Also include the criteria in NFL-AC2.	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /Assessment criteria /NFL-AC2: Buildings or structures within an outstanding natural feature and special character feature (NFL-R1); Buildings or structures within a special character landscape (NFL-R2)	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.103	Amend	Considers The criteria need to clearly direct the decision maker to consider the effects in the coastal environment. There also needs to be direction to consider avoiding, remedying and mitigating effects everywhere.	Seeks to include the following new criterion under Landscape values:  <u>The extent to which significant adverse effects in the coastal environment are avoided, and other effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u>	Open Submission
NFL - Natural Features and Landscape /Assessment criteria /NFL-AC3: Vehicle parking areas to provide public access to outstanding natural features and special character features (NFL-R4)	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.104	Amend	Considers the criteria needs to clearly direct the decision maker to consider the effects in the coastal environment for those SNFs that are located there.	Seeks to include the following new criterion under Landscape values:  <u>The extent to which significant adverse effects in the coastal environment are avoided, and other effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u>	Open Submission

# PA - Public Access

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PA - Public Access /Objectives /PA-O2: Providing linkages across the western hills to protect and enhance identified connectivity opportunities throughout Napier	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.66	Amend	This objective refers to a wider continuous off-road walkway from Ōtātara Pā to Ahuriri estuary, however, the indicative public access routes and the issue in PA-I2 only include the Mission walkways. The objective wording should be updated accordingly.	Amend PA-O2 as follows (or similar relief): - PA-O2: Providing linkages across the <del>western hills</del> <u>Mission Precincts</u> to protect and enhance identified connectivity opportunities throughout Napier. - Napier's pathway network is enhanced and developed <u>including</u> in the <del>western hills</del> <u>Mission Precincts</u> to <del>provide a continuous off-road walkway from Ōtātara Pā to Ahuriri estuary</del> and to provide connectivity to, <u>from and within</u> potential development west of Napier.	Open Submission
PA - Public Access /Issues /PA-I2: Providing linkages within the Mission precincts to protect and enhance identified connectivity opportunities	Amelia Longley	222.1	Amend	Provision PA-I2 only incorporates public access routes already identified by the Mission Hills Structure Plan, and does not consider connectivity for the rest of the city. Napier and specifically the Western Hills of Taradale have a number of existing Public Access routes which provide connectivity, opportunities for passive recreation and active transport for our community and visitors, and enhance the resilience of the city by providing alternative evacuation routes. They also offer opportunities to support biodiversity. The proposed Indicative Public Access routes identified in this submission identify further critical linkages which seek to improve the connectivity between these existing networks. They act as a mechanism to protect these routes and enable planners to identify these routes when considering applications for subdivision, to ensure that our city remains connected and accessible.  In the Western Hills these indicative routes include linkage between the Otatara Pā Historic Reserve Walk and recently completed Maggies Way at Dolbel Reserve, as well as a hilltop access routes across the proposed Rural Lifestyle Zone via the currently isolated Ridgetop Reserve at 160 Churchill Drive. A critical linkage at Tironui Drive between the top of Maggies Way, Sugarloaf/Pukekura and Lance Leikis with the within the Mission Hills Development route already identified in the Proposed District Plan is included. In addition this would provide improved access to the NCC Tironui Reservoir at 82 Tironui Drive. In other areas of Napier the routes identified in this submission increase and improve connectivity between existing networks.  Where these routes are not located on Council owned land they do not represent intended enforced acquisition, rather routes that should be considered should impacted properties be subject to subdivision in the future.	PA-I2: Providing linkages <del>within the Mission precincts</del> to protect and enhance identified connectivity opportunities <u>across Napier</u> . Napier has a large network of interlinking off-road pathways, which are increasingly popular for people seeking to undertake active recreation. The pathways also have an important role in ensuring connectivity between neighbourhoods, open spaces and to provide access to the coast. <del>The Mission development area</del> <u>Indicative Public Access Routes</u> include a number of public access routes that span development areas and potential future development areas, connecting neighbourhoods and providing recreational opportunities. The District Plan identifies these routes and provides protection of these to ensure they can be realised as <u>these areas are</u> developed.	Open Submission



# PA - Public Access

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PA - Public Access /Objectives /PA-O2: Providing linkages across the western hills to protect and enhance identified connectivity opportunities throughout Napier	Amelia Longley	222.2	Amend	<p>Provision PA-O2 only refers to public access routes across the Western Hills, and does not consider connectivity for the rest of the city. Napier and specifically the Western Hills of Taradale have a number of existing Public Access routes which provide connectivity, opportunities for passive recreation and active transport for our community and visitors, and enhance the resilience of the city by providing alternative evacuation routes. They also offer opportunities to support biodiversity. The proposed Indicative Public Access routes identified in this submission identify further critical linkages which seek to improve the connectivity between these and other existing networks. They act as a mechanism to protect these routes and enable planners to identify these routes when considering applications for subdivision, to ensure that our city remains connected and accessible.</p> <p>In the Western Hills these indicative routes include linkage between the Otatara Pā Historic Reserve Walk and recently completed Maggies Way at Dolbel Reserve, as well as a hilltop access routes across the proposed Rural Lifestyle Zone via the currently isolated Ridgetop Reserve at 160 Churchill Drive. A critical linkage at Tironui Drive between the top of Maggies Way, Sugarloaf/Pukekura and Lance Leikis with the within the Mission Hills Development route already identified in the Proposed District Plan is included. In addition this would provide improved access to the NCC Tironui Reservoir at 82 Tironui Drive. In other areas of Napier the routes identified in this submission increase and improve connectivity between existing networks.</p> <p>Where these routes are not located on Council owned land they do not represent intended enforced acquisition, rather routes that should be considered should impacted properties be subject to subdivision in the future.</p>	<p>PA-O2: Providing linkages across the western hills <u>and the wider city</u> to protect and enhance identified connectivity opportunities throughout Napier</p> <p>Napier's pathway network is enhanced and developed in the western hills to provide a continuous off-road walkway from Otātara Pā to Ahuriri estuary and to provide connectivity to potential development west of <u>and across Napier</u>.</p>	Open Submission
PA - Public Access /Policies /PA-P1: Identify public access opportunities	Amelia Longley	222.3	Amend	<p>Provision PA-P1 only refers to public access routes within the Mission Hills precincts, and does not consider connectivity for the rest of the city. Napier and specifically the Western Hills of Taradale have a number of existing Public Access routes which provide connectivity, opportunities for passive recreation and active transport for our community and visitors, and enhance the resilience of the city by providing alternative evacuation routes. They also offer opportunities to support biodiversity. The proposed Indicative Public Access routes identified in this submission identify further critical linkages which seek to improve the connectivity between these existing networks. They act as a mechanism to protect these routes and enable planners to identify these routes when considering applications for subdivision, to ensure that our city remains connected and accessible.</p> <p>In the Western Hills these indicative routes include linkage between the Otatara Pā Historic Reserve Walk and recently completed Maggies Way at Dolbel Reserve, as well as a hilltop access routes across the proposed Rural Lifestyle Zone via the currently isolated Ridgetop Reserve at 160 Churchill Drive. A critical linkage at Tironui Drive is included between the top of Maggies Way, Sugarloaf/Pukekura and Lance Leikis with the Mission Hills Development route already identified in the Proposed District Plan. In addition this would provide improved access to the NCC Tironui Reservoir at 82 Tironui Drive. In other areas of Napier the routes identified in this submission increase and improve connectivity between existing networks.</p> <p>Where these routes are not located on Council owned land they do not represent intended enforced acquisition, rather routes that should be considered should impacted properties be subject to subdivision in the future.</p>	<p>Seeks to Identify and map indicative public access routes <u>across the city within the Mission precincts</u>.</p> <p>Relates to PA-O1 and PA-O2.</p> <p>Update map to include additional Indicative Public Access Routes included in the attached/linked map.</p>	Open Submission

# PA - Public Access

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PA - Public Access /Policies /PA-P2: Protect and develop public access routesEnsure that the public access routes identified under PA-P1 are protected and able to be developed, including by:  requiring vesting of indicative public access routes through private land at the time of subdivision or development of the site, as either road or reserve; requiring another appropriate legal mechanism providing for public access along the indicative public access route in perpetuity; providing a legal mechanism to enable council access to the indicative public access route for maintenance and development; ensuring new buildings and shared driveways are not located within 20 m of an indicative public access route, and plantation forestry on sites containing an indicative public access route.  Relates to PA-O1 and PA-O2	Amelia Longley	222.4	Support	We support this policy as it provides for the protection and development of public access routes, provided the requested amendments to PA-P1 to reflect additional indicative access routes are accepted.	Retain PA-P2.	Open Submission
PA - Public Access /PA - Public Access - Rules Table /PA-R1: New building and/or shared driveway on any site containing an indicative public access route	Amelia Longley	222.5	Support	PA-R1 supports the protection and development of Public Access Routes to provide connectivity and passive recreation opportunities.	Retain PA-R1	Open Submission
PA - Public Access /PA - Public Access - Rules Table /PA-R2: Plantation forestry on any site containing an indicative public access route	Amelia Longley	222.6	Support	PA-R2 supports the protection and development of Public Access Routes to provide connectivity and passive recreation opportunities.	Retain PA-R2.	Open Submission
PA - Public Access /Objectives /PA-O1: Ensuring public access to the coastal marine area, estuary, rivers, and lakes	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.105	Amend	Public access should be restricted to ecologically vulnerable areas and/or during critical bird breeding periods. The way those sensitive areas are used needs to be managed (e.g. restricting driving on beaches and dog access in key habitats for native fauna).	Seeks to amend the objective so while public access is maintained it is controlled in areas that constitute key habitats for indigenous biodiversity.	Open Submission
PA - Public Access /General /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.106	Amend	Amend Whole chapter, including Introduction, Objectives, Policies and Rules  Arising from late notification of ECO-chapter	Seeks to Add: <u>The Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter includes provisions which relate to public access. Where there is a conflict between the Public Access chapter and the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter, the provisions that place greater or additional restrictions on activities with adverse effects on natural environments will apply</u> ”.	Open Submission

# SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /Issues /SUB-I1: Subdivision design should reflect the characteristics and amenity values of the locality in which it is located	Richard Brown	1.1	Amend	Considers there is inconsistency between RLZ-R3A (2500m2) and SUB-S3 (5000m2, with 1.5ha average), and that average lot size should be removed and that Council should maximise the use of existing lots for future developments.	Seeks to clarify inconsistency between net site area in Rule RLZ-R3A and minimum allotment size in Standard SUB-S3 [Inferred relief requested]	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O6: Subdivision in rural zones	Tony Michelle	73.9	Support	Considers that SUB-O6: Subdivision in rural zones is an important part of maintaining primary production and ancillary activities such as agricultural aviation.	Retain SUB-O6: Subdivision in rural zones as notified.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P19: Highly productive land	Tony Michelle	73.10	Amend	The submitter considers that SUB-P19: Highly productive land should be amended to better recognise protection for primary production and ancillary activities.	Amend SUB-P19: Highly productive land as follows:  Ensure subdivision avoids, if possible, or otherwise mitigates any actual loss or potential cumulative loss of the availability or productive of highly productive land by:  ... <u>e. enabling primary production and ancillary activities</u>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P7: Providing for connectivity	Peter Grant	78.21	Amend	Enabling connectivity to multiple escape routes is important for residents, particularly older residents who may have less mobility, in the event of an emergency evacuation.  Development of subdivisions and land needs to build in evacuation routes where dead-end cul-de-sacs and associated pedestrian/cycle routes /alleyways are not the only option available.	Amend for Development of subdivisions and land to build in evacuation routes where dead-end cul-de-sacs and associated pedestrian/cycle routes /alleyways are not the only option available to residents, especially those with limited mobility, for evacuation	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Assessment criteria /SUB-AC1: General, applies to all subdivision (including boundary adjustments)	Peter Grant	78.22	Amend	Enabling connectivity to multiple escape routes is important for residents, particularly older residents who may have less mobility, in the event of an emergency evacuation.  Development of subdivisions and land needs to build in evacuation routes where dead-end cul-de-sacs and associated pedestrian/cycle routes /alleyways are not the only option available.	Amend for development of subdivisions and land to build in evacuation routes where dead-end cul-de-sacs and associated pedestrian/cycle routes /alleyways are not the only option available to residents, especially those with limited mobility, for evacuation.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Issues /SUB-I7: Issues of reverse sensitivity on adjacent land uses	Rebecca Eng	99.59	Amend	On the basis of Policy NU-P4 and the amendments sought through this submission, Transpower supports the retention of the issue.	Should NU-P4 not be amended as sought in this submission, Transpower seeks amendment to the issue to give effect to the NPSET and reflect the amendments sought to NU-P4.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /	Rebecca Eng	99.60	Amend	While Transpower supports the intent of the note, amendment is required to provide reference to objectives and policies in the Network Utilities chapter. While the rule for managing subdivision in the National Grid Subdivision Corridor is contained within the Subdivision chapter, the applicable policy framework is contained in the Network Utilities chapter. This cross referencing needs to be made clear for plan users.	Amend the text as follows:  Note: The objectives and policies contained in other chapters, including (but not necessarily limited to) zone chapters and district-wide chapters, including the Transport chapter, <u>Network Utilities Chapter (as it relates to subdivision within the National Grid Subdivision Corridor)</u> , Public Access chapter, the Natural Hazards chapter, and the Hazardous Substances and Contaminated Land chapter, are relevant in addition to those below.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O3: Infrastructure, transport, and connectivity	Rebecca Eng	99.61	Amend	Considers that the management of reverse sensitivity effects in the context of ensuring that the operation, maintenance, upgrading, and development of the electricity transmission network is not compromised is achieved partly through regulating subdivision. The wording of clause (d) does not currently read clearly and does not include the full suite of activities associated with the National Grid that require protection under Policy 10 of the NPSET. Further, insofar as it relates to the National Grid, clause d does not give effect to Policy 10 because it only requires mitigation rather than avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects.  On the basis of Policy NU-P4 and the amendments sought to it through this submission, Transpower supports the retention of SUB-O3 as NU-P4 is the more relevant policy.	Should NU-P4 not be amended as sought in this submission, Transpower seeks amendment to the objective to give effect to the NPSET and reflect the amendments sought to NU-P4 as follows:  SUB-O3: Infrastructure, transport, and connectivity a. subdivision has a layout that is: i. safe, efficient, convenient, accessible, enhances connectivity and encourages active transport modes, and ii. resilient and integrates with existing communities and provides for the long-term needs of its residents. b. infrastructure supporting subdivision and development is planned and provided for in an integrated and comprehensive manner at the time of subdivision. c. land is vested at the time of subdivision to provide for high-quality reserves, esplanade reserves, roads, stormwater, access and other purposes for the benefit of the wider community. d. subdivision does not compromise the operation, maintenance, upgrade and development of, <del>protects the operation</del> and access to, established network utilities and regionally significant infrastructure while mitigating reserve sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P1: Compatible land use	Rebecca Eng	99.62	Support	Specific to the PDP Subdivision Chapter, Policy NU-P4 (as sought to be amended in this submission) within the Network Utilities Chapter provides the policy framework for subdivision within the National Grid Subdivision Corridor. However, the associated rules are provided within the Subdivision Chapter (Rule SUB-S9). On the basis of Policy NU-P4 and the amendments sought through this submission, Transpower supports the retention of the policy SUB-P1, noting it is not sufficiently directive to give effect to the NPSET and therefore reliance is required on NU-P4.	Should NU-P4 not be amended as sought in this submission, Transpower seeks amendment to SUB-P1 policy to give effect to the NPSET and reflect the amendments sought to NU-P4.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P13: Network utilities	Rebecca Eng	99.63	Support	Transpower supports the policy recognition for subdivision for network utility activities.	Retain the policy.	Open Submission

# SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Rebecca Eng	99.64	Amend	<p>As sought in the submission, Transpower seeks a stand alone National Grid Subdivision Corridors rule (refer new rule SUB-RXX - made as a general submission point). The reasoning is provided in the submission point. If accepted, this would mean the reference to SUB-S9 can be removed from the rule.</p> <p>Should the relief for a new submission point not be accepted, Transpower seeks amendment to SUB-R3 (and R3A and R3B) to amend the activity for subdivision in the National Grid Subdivisions Corridor to restricted discretionary, defaulting to non complying where the standards are not met.</p>	<p>Seeks a stand alone National Grid Subdivision Corridors rule (refer new rule SUB-RXX - made as a general submission point). If accepted, this would mean the reference to SUB-S9 can be removed from the rule.</p> <p>Should the relief for a new submission point not be accepted, Transpower seeks amendment to SUB-R3 (and R3A and R3B) to amend the activity for subdivision in the National Grid Subdivisions Corridor to restricted discretionary, defaulting to non complying where the standards are not met.</p>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision //	Rebecca Eng	99.65	Amend	<p>Considers that inappropriate subdivision and use of land within the National Grid Corridor is a potential issue that can be managed through a corridor management approach. The disconnect between the policy framework for subdivision within the National Grid Corridor (NU-P4) sits within the Network Utilities chapter while the rules for subdivision sit within the Subdivision chapter. This disconnection is potentially confusing to plan users and Transpower seeks a specific subdivision rule within the Network Utilities Chapter. Should this not be granted, Transpower seeks amendment to SUB-R9 and all the rules which reference the standard. As proposed the PDP Subdivision Chapter provides for the subdivision provisions relating to the National Grid Subdivision Corridor provided as a standard within SUB-S9, which is then referenced in each of the relevant rules. While Transpower supports a specific standard relating to subdivision within the National Grid Subdivision Corridor, Transpower seeks a stand-alone rule and a specific standard and activity status that appropriately manages subdivision within proximity of the National Grid.</p> <p>Considers that subdivision within the National Grid Subdivision Corridor should be a restricted discretionary activity where the newly created lots comply with the standards SUB-S9. Transpower is opposed to the controlled activity status as the resource consent could not be declined and would not provide the ability for Transpower to be involved in the subdivision design process or ensure the subdivision does not compromise the ability to operate, maintain and upgrade the line, including the provision of access. Where the subdivision application is unable to demonstrate that this can be achieved, a non-complying activity status would apply to the subdivision (as proposed in the notified rules).</p> <p>Seeks a restricted discretionary activity status for subdivision that demonstrates a building platform outside the National Grid Yard, and where vehicle access to support structures is maintained, as this provides an appropriate incentive to design subdivision layouts that avoid building sites within the National Grid Yard. Subdivision is considered the most effective point at which to ensure future reverse sensitivity effects, maintenance access issues, and adverse effects of transmission lines (including amenity issues) on potential activities, are avoided, through designing layouts to properly accommodate transmission corridors. The provision of a restricted discretionary activity status would be consistent with that secured across multiple district plan reviews across New Zealand. A default non-complying activity status is supported on the basis it is considered the most effective means of giving effect to the NPSET objective of managing the adverse effects of the network and managing the adverse effects of other activities on the network. In particular, a non-complying activity status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Most appropriately recognises and provides for the effective operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the network, as required by NPSET Policy 2;</li> <li>(b) Is the best method to manage other activities to ensure the operation, maintenance, upgrading, and development of the network is not compromised, as required by Policy 10.</li> <li>(c) Recognises the policy directive within Policy 11 to identify an appropriate buffer corridor within which it can be expected that sensitive activities will generally not be provided for.</li> </ul> <p>Transpower seeks a specific subdivision rule within the Network Utilities Chapter. Should this not be granted, Transpower seeks amendment to rules which reference the standard SUB-S9, to change the activity from controlled to restricted discretionary. The default non complying activity is supported.</p>	<p>Seeks a specific subdivision rule within the Network Utilities Chapter as follows, which refers to SUB-S9. Should this not be granted, Transpower seeks amendment to rules which reference the standard SUB-S9, to change the activity from controlled to restricted discretionary:</p> <p><u>SUB-RXX Subdivision within the National Grid Subdivision Corridor</u>  <u>All Zones and Overlays Areas</u>  <u>1. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Where the following condition is met:</u>  <u>a. Compliance with: SUB-S9 National Grid Subdivision Corridor.</u>  <u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u>  <u>The matters in SUB-AC9</u>  <u>2. Activity status where compliance with SUB-S9 is not achieved: Non complying</u></p> <p><u>Notification</u>  <u>An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA.</u>  <u>When deciding whether any person is affected in relation to this rule for the purposes of section 95E of the RMA, the Council will give specific consideration to any adverse effects on Transpower New Zealand Limited.</u></p>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Rebecca Eng	99.66	Amend	<p>Transpower seeks a stand alone National Grid Subdivision Corridors rule. The reasoning is provided in the submission point. If accepted, this would mean the reference to SUB-S9 can be removed from the rule.</p> <p>Should the relief sought in for a new National Grid Subdivision Corridor not be accepted, Transpower seeks amendment to SUB-R1 (and R1A and R1B) to amend the activity status for subdivision in the National Grid Subdivisions Corridor from controlled to restricted discretionary, defaulting to non complying where the standards in SUB-S9 are not met.</p>	<p>Transpower seeks a stand alone National Grid Subdivision Corridors rule. The reasoning is provided in the submission point. If accepted, this would mean the reference to SUB-S9 can be removed from the rule.</p> <p>Should the relief sought in for a new National Grid Subdivision Corridor not be accepted, Transpower seeks amendment to SUB-R1 (and R1A and R1B) to amend the activity status for subdivision in the National Grid Subdivisions Corridor from controlled to restricted discretionary, defaulting to non complying where the standards in SUB-S9 are not met.</p>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Rebecca Eng	99.67	Amend	<p>Transpower seeks a stand alone National Grid Subdivision Corridors rule. The reasoning is provided in the submission point. If accepted, this would mean the reference to SUB-S9 can be removed from the rule.</p> <p>Should the relief sought for a new National Grid Subdivision Corridor not be accepted, Transpower seeks amendment to SUB-R1 (and R1A and R1B) to amend the activity status for subdivision in the National Grid Subdivisions Corridor from controlled to restricted discretionary, defaulting to non complying where the standards in SUB-S9 are not met.</p>	<p>Transpower seeks a stand alone National Grid Subdivision Corridors rule. The reasoning is provided in the submission point. If accepted, this would mean the reference to SUB-S9 can be removed from the rule.</p> <p>Should the relief sought for a new National Grid Subdivision Corridor not be accepted, Transpower seeks amendment to SUB-R1 (and R1A and R1B) to amend the activity status for subdivision in the National Grid Subdivisions Corridor from controlled to restricted discretionary, defaulting to non complying where the standards in SUB-S9 are not met.</p>	Open Submission

# SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Rebecca Eng	99.68	Amend	<p>Transpower seeks a stand alone National Grid Subdivision Corridors rule. The reasoning is provided in the submission point. If accepted, this would mean the reference to SUB-S9 can be removed from the rule.</p> <p>Should the relief sought for a new National Grid Subdivision Corridor not be accepted, Transpower seeks amendment to SUB-R1 (and R1A and R1B) to amend the activity status for subdivision in the National Grid Subdivisions Corridor from controlled to restricted discretionary, defaulting to non complying where the standards in SUB-S9 are not met.</p>	<p>Transpower seeks a stand alone National Grid Subdivision Corridors rule. The reasoning is provided in the submission point. If accepted, this would mean the reference to SUB-S9 can be removed from the rule.</p> <p>Should the relief sought for a new National Grid Subdivision Corridor not be accepted, Transpower seeks amendment to SUB-R1 (and R1A and R1B) to amend the activity status for subdivision in the National Grid Subdivisions Corridor from controlled to restricted discretionary, defaulting to non complying where the standards in SUB-S9 are not met.</p>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Rebecca Eng	99.69	Amend	<p>Transpower seeks a stand alone National Grid Subdivision Corridors rule. The reasoning is provided in the submission point. If accepted, this would mean the reference to SUB-S9 can be removed from the rule.</p> <p>Should the relief sought for a new National Grid Subdivision Corridor not be accepted, Transpower seeks amendment to SUB-R1 (and R1A and R1B) to amend the activity status for subdivision in the National Grid Subdivisions Corridor from controlled to restricted discretionary, defaulting to non complying where the standards in SUB-S9 are not met.</p>	<p>Transpower seeks a stand alone National Grid Subdivision Corridors rule. The reasoning is provided in the submission point. If accepted, this would mean the reference to SUB-S9 can be removed from the rule.</p> <p>Should the relief sought for a new National Grid Subdivision Corridor not be accepted, Transpower seeks amendment to SUB-R1 (and R1A and R1B) to amend the activity status for subdivision in the National Grid Subdivisions Corridor from controlled to restricted discretionary, defaulting to non complying where the standards in SUB-S9 are not met.</p>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table r	Rebecca Eng	99.70	Support	<p>Notwithstanding its other submission points seeking the relocation of all the National Grid subdivision provisions within the NU Chapter and the provision of a new specific National Grid Subdivision Corridor rule, Transpower supports the standards in that they provide a clear framework for managing the effects of subdivision on the National Grid.</p>	<p>Retain SUB-S9 but relocate within the NU Chapter.</p>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Assessment criteria /SUB-AC9: National Grid Subdivision Corridor	Rebecca Eng	99.71	Amend	<p>Notwithstanding its other submission points seeking the relocation of all the National Grid subdivision provisions within the NU Chapter, Transpower supports the provision of assessment matters as they clearly articulate the issues associated with subdivision within the National Grid Subdivision Corridor.</p> <p>In order to further inform any assessment associated with a resource consent application, two additional assessment matters are sought.</p>	<p>Retain the matters within SUB-AC9 but amend as follows:</p> <p>SUB-AC9: National Grid Subdivision Corridor</p> <p>a. The extent to which the subdivision design allows for the ongoing efficient operation, maintenance, upgrading, and development of the National Grid, including the ability for continued reasonable access for inspections, maintenance, and upgrading.</p> <p>b. The extent to which the design and construction of the subdivision allows for activities to be set back from the National Grid, <u>including the ability to provide a complying building platform outside of the National Grid Yard.</u></p> <p>c. The risk of electrical hazards affecting public or individual safety and the risk of property damage.</p> <p>d. The nature and location of any vegetation to be planted in the vicinity of the National Grid and how such landscaping will impact on the operation, maintenance, upgrade, and development (including access) of the National Grid.</p> <p>e. The extent to which the subdivision design and consequential development will minimise the potential reverse sensitivity and amenity and nuisance effects of the National Grid asset.</p> <p>f. <u>The extent to which the design and construction of any subdivision allows for earthworks, buildings and structures to comply with the safe separate distance requirements in the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001.</u></p> <p>g. <u>The outcome of any technical advice provided by Transpower.</u></p>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Assessment criteria /SUB-AC7: Utility services - high voltage lines	Rebecca Eng	99.85	Oppose	<p>Opposes Assessment Criteria SUB-AC7 relating to Utility services - high voltage lines. The PDP does not define or explain what network utility constitutes 'high voltage lines' and the term is not used anywhere else in the PDP. On the basis SUB-AC7 applies to the National Grid, Transpower does not consider the criteria necessary as subdivision within the National Grid Subdivision Corridor is addressed under SUB-AC9. The duplication of the assessment criteria is potentially confusing to plan users and is neither efficient or effective.</p>	<p>Seeks SUB-AC7 to be deleted. On the basis SUB-AC7 applies to the National Grid, Transpower does not consider the criteria necessary as subdivision within the National Grid Subdivision Corridor is addressed under SUB-AC9. The duplication of the assessment criteria is potentially confusing to plan users and is neither efficient or effective.</p>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O1: Compatible land use	Rebecca Eng	99.86	Support	<p>On the basis subdivision within the National Grid Subdivision Corridor is managed under NU-P4, Transpower is neutral on SUB-O1.</p> <p>However should NU-P4 not be amended as sought in the Transpower submission, Transpower seeks amendment to SUB-O1 to give effect to the NPSET.</p>	<p>Retain SUB-O1 on the basis NU-P4 is amended as sought in the Transpower submission. Should NU-P4 not be amended, Transpower seeks amendment to SUB-O1 to give effect to the NPSET.</p>	Open Submission

# SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Cameron Lloyd Kerry Beard Peter Oliver	120.2	Amend	Considers that SUB-S3 (Minimum allotment sizes - rural) minimum allotment size should be reduced from 5000m2 to 1000m2 for Nos. 549, 553, 555, 565, 567 Main North Road, Bay View as these properties are larger than surrounding residential properties that they have been grouped together with such as Rogers Road that does not have Rural character and has average 1000m2 lot sizes; have or can build their own sewage treatment systems; and without needed intensification for housing shortages will result in the inefficient use of land that is too small for agricultural economic purposes.	Amend SUB-S3 (Minimum allotment sizes - rural) as follows:  SUB-S3: Minimum allotment sizes - rural  <u>Rural Lifestyle Zone 1,000 m2 minimum allotment size.</u> <del>Rural Lifestyle Zone</del> -Mission Rural Residential Precinct 5,000 m2 minimum allotment size with a minimum average allotment size of 1.5 ha. The minimum average allotment size must be calculated using the parent allotment in existence as at 11 November 2000. This parent allotment will be the base for any further proposed subdivision.  Or else seeks that areas labelled RLZ in Bay View are included in a new zone under SUB-S3 with a smaller minimum lot size (e.g. Jervoisstown Precinct).  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Tom Hosford	124.2	Amend	Considers that 100 Churchill Drive which is zoned as RLZ (Rural Lifestyle Zone), TEZ (Tertiary Education Zone) and Special Character Landscapes - Taradale Hills (SCL:01) Natural Environmental Values Overlay in the PDP is an inefficient use of the land given its 1.5 ha minimum average lot size Standard (SUB-S3: minimum allotment sizes - rural) and proximity to the urban environment. Rezoning instead with a lesser subdivision site size would avoid urban sprawl in accordance with HPUDS and NPS-UD.  (The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)	Amend SUB-S3: Minimum allotment sizes - rural as follows:  Rural Lifestyle Zone, Mission Rural Residential Precinct <u>(not connecting to reticulated water and wastewater)</u> 5,000 m2 minimum allotment size with a minimum average allotment size of 1.5 ha. The minimum average allotment size must be calculated using the parent allotment in existence as at 11 November 2000. This parent allotment will be the base for any further proposed subdivision. Activity Status where standards are not met: Non-complying  <u>Rural Lifestyle Zone (connecting to reticulated water and wastewater)</u> <u>3,000 m2 minimum allotment size.</u> <u>Activity Status where standards are not met: Non-complying</u>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table /	Cameron Drury	128.7	Amend	Considers it is not clear from either the "How the plan works" section or the Subdivision activity table that precinct specific subdivision provisions override the district-wide provisions in the subdivision chapter.	Seeks to clarify that rules pertaining to subdivision in the Precinct Rule Tables apply over rules applying to subdivision in the SUB Rules Table.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Cameron Drury	128.8	Amend	The purpose and objectives and policies of a zone, precinct, and development area are not matters that should be re-traversed in the assessment of a Controlled Activity. This is too broad to be a matter of control.	Remove (1) from the matters of control.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Cameron Drury	128.9	Amend	Matters of control for which conditions of consent may be imposed should be more specific so as to not become a de facto discretionary activity. The current list of matters of control introduce unnecessary complexity and uncertainty to subdivision as a controlled activity, increasing costs of regulation.	Amend the matters of control to be more specific.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Cameron Drury	128.11	Oppose	The Mission Rural Residential Precinct presents opportunity for a greater intensity of development. This will provide for additional housing choice in the city by enabling sites that still retain an open character but have less maintenance requirements. In addition to a smaller minimum lot size, assessment criteria can be relied on to ensure servicing is achieved for all sites to be created.	Amend the minimum lot size for the Mission Rural Residential Precinct to 1,000m2 with no average control. Subsequent changes may be required to Assessment Criteria.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Cameron Drury	128.12	Oppose	Outcome sought is unclear. Regardless of the number of new allotments, the relevant assessment criteria apply. This introduces an additional layer of complexity for subdivision applications that does not appear to be justified.	Clarify the purpose of the Standard / does it apply to the Mission Precincts and/or delete standard.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Cameron Drury	128.13	Oppose	There are no provisions in DEV3, while subdivision within the Development Area is regulated by PREC2 and PREC7 in any case. This is unnecessary duplication.	Delete standard.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Cameron Drury	128.14	Oppose	A low impact stormwater solution has already been developed for the Mission Development Area.	Exclude the Mission Development Area from the Standard as in SUB-S18.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Cameron Drury	128.15	Oppose	Pathways are already provided for within the existing planning framework pertaining to the Mission Development Area.	Exclude the Mission Development Area from the Standard as in SUB-S17.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Cameron Drury	128.16	Amend	Unclear as to the implications of the Mission Development Area esplanade reserve requirements on the properties concerned.	Update according to new lot and zone/precinct references.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Assessment criteria /	Cameron Drury	128.34	Oppose	The planning framework for the Mission Development Area was developed through a specific Plan Change process which produced a specific assessment criteria to guide development. It is not necessary to introduce additional matters.	Exclude consideration of the subdivision within the Mission development Area from SUB assessment criteria.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Assessment criteria /SUB-AC1: General, applies to all subdivision (including boundary adjustments)	Cameron Drury	128.35	Oppose	Oppose SUB-AC1(a) - Compliance or otherwise with rules is the reason for an activity needing to be assessed against an assessment criteria and should not be re traversed. Similarly, whether a subdivision is consistent with all objectives and policies is a section 104(1)(a) matter and does not need to be re-traversed in an assessment criteria. Further, 'consistent with' is not the test in any case.	Delete (a).	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Assessment criteria /SUB-AC2: Subdivision of three sites or more in residential, rural, commercial, and industrial zones (Number of allotments created SUB-S6)	Cameron Drury	128.36	Oppose	SUB-AC2(d) - Cul-de-sac options are enjoyed by the community and should not be limited to the circumstances stated.	Amend to allow flexibility based onsite specific characteristics, and not be so prohibitive.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Assessment criteria /SUB-AC2: Subdivision of three sites or more in residential, rural, commercial, and industrial zones (Number of allotments created SUB-S6)	Cameron Drury	128.37	Oppose	Oppose SUB-AC2(h) - There is insufficient guidance to the community as to how this assessment criteria would be implemented.	Clarify the circumstances where vesting of infrastructure would not be accepted.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Assessment criteria /SUB-AC2: Subdivision of three sites or more in residential, rural, commercial, and industrial zones (Number of allotments created SUB-S6)	Cameron Drury	128.38	Oppose	Oppose SUB-AC2(n)(ii) - Objectives and Policies should not be included as part of an assessment criteria. Further, none are proposed for consideration as part of this process.	Delete or amend to be more specific as to the matters to be considered.	Open Submission

# SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /Assessment criteria /SUB-AC2: Subdivision of three sites or more in residential, rural, commercial, and industrial zones (Number of allotments created SUB-S6)	Cameron Drury	128.39	Oppose	Oppose SUB-AC2(a) - Objectives and Policies should not be included as part of an assessment criteria. Further, none are proposed for consideration as part of this process.	Delete (a).	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Nick Wakefield	131.1	Amend	Considers the SUB-S1: Minimum allotment sizes - residential LLRZ (Large Lot Residential Zone) Standard of a minimum average allotment size of 3,000m2 are inappropriate and should be replaced with a minimum lot size in a residential area.	Amend SUB-S1: Minimum allotment sizes - residential as follows:  Large Lot Residential 1,000 m2 minimum net allotment size <del>with a minimum average allotment size of 3,000 m2.</del>  Activity Status where standards are not met: Non-complying	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Nick Wakefield	131.2	Amend	Considers reference to the parent lot in existence as at 11 November 2000 in the RLZ (Rural Lifestyle Zone) of the SUB-S3: Minimum allotment sizes - rural Standard as irrelevant and results in a non-complying activity through what appears to be a provision that has been simply rolled over from the Operative Plan.	Amend SUB-S3: Minimum allotment sizes - rural as follows:  <u>Rural Lifestyle Zone</u> <u>5,000 m2 minimum net allotment size.</u> <u>Activity Status where standards are not met: Non-complying.</u>  <del>Rural Lifestyle Zone</del> , Mission Rural Residential Precinct 5,000 m2 minimum allotment size with a minimum average allotment size of 1.5 ha. The minimum average allotment size must be calculated using the parent allotment in existence as at 11 November 2000. This parent allotment will be the base for any further proposed subdivision.  Activity Status where standards are not met: Non-complying	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Nick Wakefield	131.3	Amend	Seeks SUB-R12 and such further other amendments under the NPS-HPL as considered appropriate and necessary to address their concerns to enable Council to receive and consider alternative assessments of land use capability ("LUC") by relevant experts where particular soils may have been incorrectly mapped in type and extent as LUC 1-3 - Highly Productive Land but are in fact not, so as to ensure the efficient use of land.	Amend SUB-R12 to enable the applicant to put forward an expert assessment as to whether the land qualifies as "highly productive land" (Inferred)	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Nick Wakefield	131.4	Amend	The submitter considers that they fully support the purpose of SUB-R4: Subdivision to create conservation lots for the protection of scheduled heritage items, archaeological sites, and / or sites of significance to Māori. However, by way of contrast there is no equivalent Rule in the PDP that provides for the creation of a Conservation Lot in conjunction with the protection of an area of significant indigenous and / or significant habitats of indigenous flora or fauna.  The submitter postulates that this may be because the assessment of indigenous areas and habitats of indigenous flora and fauna has been delayed as one of 3 future variations of the PDP review process given the NPSIB came into effect on 4 August 2023 and there has been insufficient time to carry out the additional work in the PDP to comply with its provisions. This is as much as stated in SUB-R6: Subdivision on land within or containing a significant natural area.	Amend SUB-R6 such that indigenous biodiversity is dealt with in its own Rule in order to give effect to the NPSIB and create Conservation Lot incentives.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Nick Wakefield	131.5	Amend	Considers the rationale behind SUB-S2: Minimum allotment sizes - commercial and industrial Standard of 2500m2 for the Large Format Retail Zone ("LFRZ") in the PDP versus 1000m2 in the Operative Plan is not clearly understood and is unduly restrictive.	Amend SUB-S2: Minimum allotment sizes - commercial and industrial LFRZ with transitional provisions (e.g. referencing the allotment being in existence as at XX [Month] [Year]) to avoid the activity defaulting to Discretionary Activity status given the significant size change from that existing.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O6: Subdivision in rural zones	Jimmy Guerin	134.9	Support	Considers that SUB-O6: Subdivision in rural zones is an important part of maintaining primary production and ancillary activities such as agricultural aviation.	Retain SUB-O6: Subdivision in rural zones as notified.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P19: Highly productive land	Jimmy Guerin	134.10	Amend	The submitter considers that SUB-P19: Highly productive land should be amended to better recognise protection for primary production and ancillary activities.	Amend SUB-P19: Highly productive land to add as follows:  Ensure subdivision avoids, if possible, or otherwise mitigates any actual loss or potential cumulative loss of the availability or productive of highly productive land by:  <u>e. enabling primary production and ancillary activities.</u>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision //	Jeff Reid	136.1	Oppose	Opposes the zoning of Large Lot Residential Zone ("LLRZ") for Kent Terrace, Lakeview Terrace, Ridgeway Terrace. The area should be zoned General Residential Zone ("GRZ") instead.  (Refer to original submission for full reasons).	Rezone Kent Terrace, Lakeview Terrace, Ridgeway Terrace from LLRZ to GRZ.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Jeff Reid	136.2	Oppose	Considers that if the LLRZ is still considered appropriate then the SUB - Subdivision Standards Table LLRZ average lot size 3000m2 requirement should be removed and the minimum lot size of 1000m2 should remain to achieve larger than average residential lot sizes in accordance with the majority of sites fronting Kent Terrace in this zone.  (Refer to original submission for full reasons)	Seeks that SUB-S1: Minimum allotment sizes - residential section is amended as follows:  Large Lot Residential 1,000 m2 minimum allotment size <del>with a minimum average allotment size of 3,000 m2.</del>  <b>Activity Status where standards are not met: Non-complying</b>	Open Submission

# SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Alison Francis	139.2	Amend	Considers references to the parent lot in existence as at 11 November 2000 and to the minimum average allotment size of 1.5 ha in the RLZ (Rural Lifestyle Zone) of the SUB-S3: Minimum allotment sizes - rural Standard as irrelevant given the areas are already heavily developed and it is unlikely that they will be able to meet the parent lot in existence date. Limiting the amount of subdivision potential in these zones will not help to meet longer term growth. They also consider that 1.5ha is too big to be used effectively as a lifestyle lot and too small to be used for a productive lot.	Amend the subdivision provisions for the Rural Lifestyle Zone to 5,000m <sup>2</sup> minimum allotment size.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Pip Beachen	142.49	Amend	Supports the removal of minimum lot sizes for subdivision of an approved (or concurrent) resource consent for multiple residential units. Minimum lot sizes should apply to vacant lot subdivisions only. Subdivision of approved or concurrent land use consents should not require revisiting internal non-compliances with development standards, providing that subdivision boundaries are consistent with nominal boundaries that we request be shown on the land use consent plans. Assessing technical infringements where there is no material impact on the approved design or effects on the environment (including onsite and neighbouring property amenity), adds cost and time to subdivision consenting processes without adding any value in terms of outcomes.  Opposes a non-complying activity status for residential subdivisions which do not comply with minimum allotment sizes. Considers that the notified rule framework seems overly restrictive for enabling smaller houses on smaller lots of 250m <sup>2</sup> – 350m <sup>2</sup> which are not considered to be inconsistent with the residential environment. Notes that assessing activities as a non-complying activity increases reporting costs and risk for developers.	Retain provisions enabling no minimum lot size where subdivision gives effect to an approved or concurrent land use consent for multiple residential units. Amend the activity status for residential subdivisions which do not comply with minimum lot size to be a Discretionary Activity	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Pip Beachen	142.50	Amend	Considers that the 'treatment' of stormwater could mean multiple things and is open to interpretation. Also considers that this standard is not consistent with the new stormwater rules within the SW chapter and does not support this standard as it has been notified.	Amend Rule to provide greater clarity around what it is trying to achieve and to obtain consistency of stormwater requirements throughout the Plan.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /New subdivision reduces, or does not increase, the risks from natural hazards to people, property, and infrastructure.	Sera Chambers	150.112	Amend	considers that this information appears to support future greenfield development in the hills of Napier rather than intensification in low-lying areas of Napier, including Onekawa and Pirimai. It would be prudent of NCC to make any decisions on the medium-density residential zone without taking this current information into account.	seeks to amend to ensure that decisions on the medium-density residential zone do not take this current information into account.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Issues /Quality urban design is concerned not just with appearances and built form but with the environmental, economic, and social consequences of design. It is a multi-faceted approach that includes both the process of decision-making as well as the outcomes of good subdivision design.	Sera Chambers	150.113	Amend	considers that a further point should be added to the list of impacts of poorly designed layouts.	seeks to amend to add:  <u>8. are not premised on the enjoyment of existing adjoining property owner rights as a guiding principle.</u>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /	Tom Anderson	151.60	Support	Supports as integration between land use and infrastructure is necessary.	Retain the objective as notified	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /Require subdivision to provide servicing that meets the requirements of the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure	Tom Anderson	151.61	Support	Supports the intent of policy	Retain the policy as notified	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /	Tom Anderson	151.62	Amend	Considers that it is unclear whether this submission applies in addition to SUB-P9. . If SUB-P9 is only for urban areas, then requirements for new allotments in rural areas to be able to connect to telecommunications networks should be included.	Amend the policy as follows:  a. Require sites capable of containing a building, in areas where no reticulated water supply, stormwater, or wastewater network is available, to be of a size and shape that provides for: i. the treatment and disposal of stormwater in a way that does not lead to significant adverse offsite effects including degraded water quality, erosion, land instability, and/or creation or exacerbation of flooding. ii. the management of wastewater via: l. an appropriate on-site wastewater treatment system, or ll. approval to connect to a private wastewater network. the storage of potable water. b. Manage the design and location of subdivision to avoid the close proximity of multiple access points on rural roads. c. <u>Provide for connectivity to telecommunications networks</u>  Relates to SUB-O3, SUB-O7	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P13: Network utilities	Tom Anderson	151.63	Support	Supports as the policy is appropriate	Retain the policy as notified	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Tom Anderson	151.64	Support	Supports controlled activity status for subdivision, with infrastructure as a matter of control	Retain the rule as notified.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Tom Anderson	151.65	Support	Supports not requiring subdivision for network utilities to meet certain standards that are not necessarily relevant	Retain the rule as notified	Open Submission



# SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table /	Tom Anderson	151.66	Amend	Supports standard however considers that telecommunications connections do not necessarily have to be physical and this should be recognised in the standard. The ability to connect to a telecommunication network should be confirmed by a telecommunication company.	Amend the standard as follows:  <b>All zones</b> 1. Each allotment must be designed and located so that provision is made for power lines, gas distribution pipes (where available) and <u>the ability to connect to</u> a telecommunication network <del>lines</del> . 2. With the exception of industrial and rural zones, all utility services must be laid underground. 3. At the time of subdivision, sufficient land for telecommunications, transformers and any associated ancillary services must be set aside. 4. All necessary easements for the protection of network utility services must be duly granted and reserved <b>Matters of discretion:</b> The ability of the site to be adequately serviced by network utilities, andPublic health and safety.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision / /	Keith Peacock	164.1	Oppose	Opposes Large Lot Residential Zoning of Kent Terrace, Lakeview Terrace, Ridgeway Terrace and considers it should be zoned General Residential. The first matter of this submission is whether a specific individual zoning for the Kent terrace and surrounds is needed. Notes that this is the only Large Lot Residential Zone in the city and encompasses only a small area in Taradale. Considers that there is no need for this additional zone and the area should be zoned General Residential. Kent Terrace and the surrounding hills are fundamental residential in nature given the scale and intensity of development in this area over the last 1 years. Also notes that rezoning would see consistency of zoning and character with the balance of Kent Terrace and adjoining Cumberland Rise. Considers that the sites are fully serviced by Councils 3-Waters infrastructure and it is considered that the most effective use of the land resource and services network is to see a reduction in the average lot size restrictions of the proposed zone. The most effective way to achieve this is zoning the area General Residential. It will allow for higher density in part and reduce pressure on urban sprawl and development over the Heretaunga Plains Soil resource and align with HPUDS and specific infill development targets set out in this strategy. Considers that the 'special zone' is proposed as a means to maintain status quo. It is argued that there is no need for this special zone in the pending Proposed District Plan as the area is now developed in a nature similar to other parts of Taradale which are simply zoned General Residential (Churchill Drive, Cumberland Rise, etc) .The decision to maintain a larger lot sizes does not match other council decisions to see higher density in existing and proposed residential areas including the recent Mission development plan change. Considers that traditionally larger lot residential zones are generally a requirement for non-reticulated sites, such as Jervois Town. which is not the case with this area. Notes the importance of having resilient housing options needs to be taken into account and that this area of the Taradale Hills provides for resilient housing elevated above any flood risk, and is not situated on liquefiable land. Considers that zoning this land General Residential also aligns with the Mission Hills Development Zoning located in similar topography.	Amend zoning for Kent Terrace, Lakeview Terrace and Ridgeway Terrace Large Lot Residential Zone to a General Residential Zone. Refer to original submission for attached map.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Keith Peacock	164.2	Oppose	Opposes Average Lot Size. Considers that if Large Lot Residential Zoning is necessary, changes should be made. Considers that Kent Terrace and the surrounding hills are fundamental residential in nature given the scale and intensity of development in this area over the last 10 years. Notes the sites are fully serviced by Councils 3-Waters infrastructure and it is considered that the most effective use of the land resource and services network is to see a reduction in the average lot size restrictions of the proposed zone. The most effective way to achieve this is zoning the area General Residential. By removing the average lot size requirement it will allow for increased density in part and reduce pressure on urban sprawl and development over the Heretaunga Plains Soil resource and align with HPUDS and specific infill development targets set out in this strategy. The decision to maintain a larger lot sizes does not match other council decisions to see higher density in existing and proposed residential areas including the recent Mission development plan change. Traditionally larger lot residential zones are generally a requirement for non-reticulated sites, such as Jervois Town which is not the case with this area. Considers that a minimum lot size of 1000m2 still achieves, for the most part, larger than average residential lot sizes and this matches the majority of sites fronting the Kent Terrace in this zone. Site topography will still dictate lot sizes. The land use rules and standards will ensure the bulk and location of proposed dwellings will still maintain the separation of dwellings and maintain 'open nature' of the area. The average lot size in this zone is already well below the 3,000m2 average that the zone is trying to achieve through this rule. Therefore the rule does not even reflect the reality of the 'existing environment' and is trying to achieve a lower density than existing. Notes the importance of having resilient housing options needs to be taken into accountand this area of the Taradale Hills provides for resilient housing elevated above any flood risk, and is not situated on liquefiable land. Considers that zoning this land General Residential also aligns with the Mission Hills Development Zoning located in similar topography. Considers that there is an opportunity here to see additional development in this area of Napier in a sustainable manner, and there is real need to use our existing land and services resource efficiently and efficiently. A bespoke zone for this area is not considered necessary, but if councils considers it is, we ask that the average lot size is removed as to still allow for the effective development of the remaining larger lots to help provide housing for a growing city.	Remove the proposed 3,000m2 average lot size requirement and the minimum lot size of 1000m2 remain to achieve the larger lot size envisaged by the zoning.	Open Submission

# SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /Issues /SUB-I2: The impacts of subdivision on natural resources (landscapes, water quality, biodiversity, and highly productive land)	James Witham	165.16	Amend	Considers that the issue should identify that effects can occur in adverse effects both within and between zones. This recognises that not all effects are 'in-situ'.	Amend SUB-I2 as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:  <b>SUB-I2 The impacts of subdivision on natural resources (landscapes, water quality, biodiversity, and highly productive land)</b>  While the process of subdivision itself does not directly affect the environment, it establishes the legal framework within which land use occurs and generally intensifies development and, therefore, has a causal link with the adverse effects of land use and development <u>both within and between zones</u> . It is, therefore, vital that these effects are addressed early at subdivision stage through the provision of adequate infrastructure services and a subdivision design that achieves quality and sustainable development.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Issues /SUB-I7: Issues of reverse sensitivity on adjacent land uses	James Witham	165.17	Amend	Considers that the issue is generally appropriate, but some points of clarification are required to complete the issues it is describing as many different activities can co-exist without concern. However, it is where activities that have different amenity requirements that conflict where concern arises. Some of these activities have localised effects and others have broader effects that go beyond adjoining or adjacent sites. Also considers the definition of 'reverse sensitivity' is narrow and only applies in circumstances where activities are established and more sensitive activities establish later. Notes that the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land directs priority to be given to land based primary production on Highly Productive Land, regardless of when it is established. Also notes objectives and policies of the PNDP supports primary production on Versatile Soils and the Rural Production Zone generally. Where sensitive activities are established and there is a change from one land based primary production activity to another the term 'reverse sensitivity' does not apply. Considers that the effects of land based primary production should be prioritised and sensitivity issues managed.	Amend SUB-I7 as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:  SUB-I7: Issues of reverse sensitivity <u>and/or sensitivity of on adjacent</u> uses.  There is potential for conflict when <del>different</del> land uses <u>with differing amenity requirements</u> are located <del>adjacent in close proximity</del> to each other. Subdivision typically intensifies land use activities in specific locations, which has the potential to create reverse sensitivity effects on established land uses or the potential of <u>primary production</u> on highly productive land. A different level of amenity can be experienced when subdivision created the ability for new sensitive issues (particularly residential and lifestyle activities) to establish <del>adjacent in close proximity</del> to existing rural, commercial, or industrial zones and/or activities, <u>or the range of existing or new activities promoted by their zones</u> . The expectation of the new activities is for a level of amenity that is not necessarily compatible with the amenity of the existing, or promoted environment and can impact on the ability of existing <u>and/or promoted</u> new activities to continue their <del>daily</del> operations.  <u>Where appropriate, subdivision for sensitive activities in environments with incompatible levels of amenity should be avoided.</u> Mitigation measures such as <u>noise insulation requirements for sensitive uses</u> , planting buffers and site layout should be considered and incorporated at the time of subdivision where the potential for reverse sensitivity exists.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O1: Compatible land use	James Witham	165.18	Amend	Considers the definition of 'reverse sensitivity' is narrow and only applies in circumstances where activities are established and more sensitive activities establish later. Notes that the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land directs priority to be given to land based primary production on Highly Productive Land, regardless of when it is established. Also notes objectives and policies of the PNDP supports primary production on Versatile Soils and the Rural Production Zone generally. Where sensitive activities are established and there is a change from one land based primary production activity to another the term 'reverse sensitivity' does not apply.  Considers that the effects of land based primary production should be prioritised and sensitivity issues managed. Considers that the term 'conflicts of uses' describes the situation more appropriately. Other policies can determine which activities and circumstances apply when determining priority and management actions.	Amend SUB-O1: Compatible land use as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:  SUB-O1: Compatible land use  Subdivision delivers quality community environments and patterns of development that ensure the objectives, policies and rules of the relevant zone of the District Plan are able to be met and potential <del>reverse sensitivity effects</del> <u>amenity conflicts between land uses</u> are avoided or mitigated.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O2: Impact of the built environment on landscapes, biodiversity, water quality, and other key environmental matters	James Witham	165.19	Amend	Considers that the objective should be amended to provide clarity regarding the reference to productive soils as meeting the definition of Highly Productive Soils in the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land versus the soils referred to in the Hawkes Bay Regional Council's Regional Resource Management Plan as Versatile Soils	Amend SUB-O2 Impact of the built environment on landscapes, biodiversity, water quality, and other key  environmental matters as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:  SUB-O2 Impact of the built environment on landscapes, biodiversity, water quality, and other key environmental matters  Land is subdivided in a way to create development that: a. Responds positively to the site's physical characteristics and context; b. Protects, maintains or enhances natural features, landscapes, indigenous biodiversity, waterbodies, significant trees, <del>productive soils</del> <u>Highly Productive Land and Versatile land</u> , reserves, public open space, and historic heritage, and c. Achieves the maintenance and enhancement of water quality by incorporating low impact design principles.	Open Submission

# SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O6: Subdivision in rural zones Subdivision of rural land.	James Witham	165.20	Amend	<p>Considers the definition of 'reverse sensitivity' is narrow and only applies in circumstances where activities are established and more sensitive activities establish later. Notes that the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land directs priority to be given to land based primary production on Highly Productive Land, regardless of when it is established. Also notes objectives and policies of the PNDP supports primary production on Versatile Soils and the Rural Production Zone generally. Where sensitive activities are established and there is a change from one land based primary production activity to another the term 'reverse sensitivity' does not apply.</p> <p>Considers that the effects of land based primary production should be prioritised and sensitivity issues managed.Considers that the term 'conflicts of uses' describes the situation more appropriately. Other policies can determine which activities and circumstances apply when determining priority and management actions.</p>	<p>Amend SUB-O6: Subdivision in rural zones matters as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:</p> <p>SUB-O6: Subdivision in rural zones Subdivision of rural land: a. protects highly productive land; b. ensures rural lifestyle subdivision is contained within the Rural Lifestyle Zone and avoided within the highly productive land in the Rural Productive Zone, and c. avoids <del>reverse sensitivity effects conflicts of uses by prioritising between rural activities and</del> primary production activities <u>over non-rural or non- primary production and sensitive activities.</u></p>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P1: Compatible land use	James Witham	165.21	Amend	<p>Considers the definition of 'reverse sensitivity' is narrow and only applies in circumstances where activities are established and more sensitive activities established later. Notes that the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land directs priority to be given to land based primary production on Highly Productive Land, regardless of when it is established. Also notes objectives and policies of the PNDP supports primary production on Versatile Soils and the Rural Production Zone generally. Where sensitive activities are established and there is a change from one land based primary production activity to another the term 'reverse sensitivity' does not apply.</p> <p>Considers that the effects of land based primary production should be prioritised and sensitivity issues managed.Considers that the term 'conflicts of uses' describes the situation more appropriately. Other policies can determine which activities and circumstances apply when determining priority and management actions.</p>	<p>Amend SUB-P1: Compatible land use as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:</p> <p>SUB-P1: Compatible land useEnsure subdivision supports the objectives, policies and rules of the District Plan through subdivision that: a. reflects patterns of development that are compatible with and reinforce the roles, function and predominant character of the zone; b. adheres to allotment size and layout in each zone to sufficiently accommodate intended land uses while retaining reasonable amenity; c. provides for intensification of the urban area where is can be supported by existing infrastructure and contributed to the viability and vibrancy or urban centres: d. incorporates setbacks, landscaping, or layout design to avoid or mitigate the effects of <del>reverse sensitivity conflicts of amenity requirements on existing, lawfully established activities on adjoining properties between sensitive activities and activities that meet</del> <u>the character and amenity requirements of the zone, including along zone interfaces,</u> and e. provides for minor boundary adjustments which enable a more efficient and effective use of land.</p>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P19: Highly productive land	James Witham	165.22	Amend	<p>Considers the policy is inconsistent in the manner it addresses significant parts of it though it largely gives effect to the relevant matters in the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. Considers that it is more efficient to refer to the relevant sections and where they are of substantial size and complexity.</p>	<p>Amend SUB-P19: Highly productive land as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:</p> <p>SUB-P19: Highly productive land Ensure subdivision avoids, if possible, or otherwise mitigates any actual loss or potential cumulative loss of the availability or productive <u>capacity</u> of highly productive land and versatile land by: a. providing for the amalgamation of smaller holdings on highly productive land. b. Avoiding subdivision for the purpose of rural lifestyle. c. Allowing subdivision in accordance with Section 3.8 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022. d. Providing for subdivision <u>only where the matters in clause 3.10(1) applies and the matters in clause 3.10(2) and 3 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022 are satisfied.:</u> i. <del>Highly productive land is subject to permanent or long term constraints in accordance with Section 3.10 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.</del> ii. <del>It avoids any significant loss of productive capacity;</del> iii. <del>It avoids the fragmentation of large or geographically cohesive area of highly productive land, and</del> iv. <del>The environmental, social, cultural and economic benefits outweigh the long-term environmental, social, cultural and economic costs associated with the loss of highly productive land, taking into account both tangible and intangible values.</del></p>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P20: Small lots in rural production zone	James Witham	165.23	Support	<p>Supports the policy as it appropriately manages small lots in the Rural Production Zone and assists in giving effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.</p>	<p>Retain SUB-P20: Small lots in rural production zone as notified</p>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	James Witham	165.24	Support	<p>Supports the SUB-R8: Subdivision of lifestyle sites within the Productive Rural Zone with amalgamation rule as it appropriately manages small lots in the Rural Production Zone and assists in giving effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.</p>	<p>Retain SUB- R8 Subdivision of lifestyle sites within the Productive Rural Zone with amalgamation as notified</p>	Open Submission

# SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	James Witham	165.25	Amend	Supports the SUB-R12 rule generally, but considers that it should include the versatile soils identified by the Hawkes Bay Regional Council in the Regional Policy Statement definition to more appropriately give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Amend SUB-R12 Subdivision of highly productive land as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission: SUB-R12 Subdivision of highly productive land <u>and versatile land</u> Activity Status: Non-complying	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	James Witham	165.26	Support	Supports retention of adequate sizes to support land based primary production in the Productive Rural Zone.	Retain SUB-S3 Minimum allotment sizes - Rural as notified	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	James Witham	165.27	Amend	Supports standard in general particularly where it seeks to avoid location of building platforms on Highly Productive Land. Considers that subdivision provides an opportunity to consider and anticipate reverse sensitivity effects and conflicts of uses, particularly along zone interfaces such as conflicts between sensitive uses such as residential uses and the amenity requirements for land based primary production. Considers provisions could provide more detail certain matters to consider and in terms of requirements to avoid or otherwise mitigate conflicts of uses. Considers that this would more appropriately give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Amend SUB-S8: Building platform as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:  SUB-S8: Building platform .....3. the building platform must be located outside and exclusive of any: ..... <u>x. area within 30 metres of a zone boundary with the Rural Production Zone.</u> <u>xx. the area within 300m of an existing and/or consented frost fan. Matters or discretion...</u>  <u>6. Design, construction and location requirements to avoid or appropriately mitigate reverse sensitivity and/or conflicts of uses.</u>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Assessment criteria /SUB-AC1: General, applies to all subdivision (including boundary adjustments)	James Witham	165.28	Amend	Generally supports the assessment criteria, but requires amendment to ensure that sensitivity effects are included and not solely the narrow matters that relate to reverse sensitivity. Considers that criteria could take a stronger approach than merely to 'consider' these effects and rather seeks to implement in a manner that avoids or mitigates sensitivity effects. Also considers that the Versatile Land is recommended to be included on the basis that they will likely result in similar activities to Highly Versatile Land.	Amend SUB-AC1: General, applies to all subdivision (including boundary adjustments) as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:  SUB-AC1: General, applies to all subdivision (including boundary adjustments) ..... Management of potential <del>reverse</del> sensitivity effects on existing <u>and promoted</u> land uses  aa. the extent to which the subdivision design <del>considers</del> <u>implements measures to avoid or mitigate reverse</u> sensitivity effects on existing or permitted uses, including avoidance of <del>reverse</del> sensitivity effects on <u>to</u> land based primary production activities <u>and, on</u> highly productive land <u>and versatile land</u> . Design mitigation techniques may include but are not limited to, planting, setbacks, locating non-sensitive components of land in the most affected areas ect. ab. Effects to be <u>avoided or</u> mitigated may include, noise, odour, spray drift, dust, vibration and traffic. .....	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Assessment criteria /SUB-AC4: Subdivision not meeting building platform standard (SUB-S8)	James Witham	165.29	Amend	Generally supports the assessment criteria particularly where it seeks to avoid location of building platforms on Highly Productive Land. Considers that subdivision provides an opportunity to consider and anticipate reverse sensitivity effects and conflicts of uses, particularly along zone interfaces such as conflicts between sensitive uses such as residential uses and the amenity requirements for land based primary production. Considers that the provisions would benefit from more detail on certain matters to consider and in terms of requirements for reverse sensitivity, including for frost fans in close proximity.	Amend SUB-AC4: Subdivision not meeting building platform standard (SUB-S8) as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:  SUB-AC4: Subdivision not meeting building platform standard (SUB-S8)  Reverse sensitivity  i. The potential for reverse sensitivity issues where building platforms are proposed to be located within close proximity to an existing or consented network utility.  <u>x. The potential for subsequent anticipated activities to be sensitive to existing or anticipated land based primary production activities.</u> <u>xx. The need for noise insulation for sensitive activities where building platforms are within 300m from an existing and/or consented frost fan.</u>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O1: Compatible land use	Sheena McGuire	168.69	Support	Supports this objective and its intention to ensure that potential reverse sensitivity effects from subdivision are avoided or mitigated.	Retain as proposed	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O3: Infrastructure, transport, and connectivity	Sheena McGuire	168.70	Support	Supports this objective and intention to protection operation and access to regionally significant infrastructure while mitigating reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P1: Compatible land use	Sheena McGuire	168.71	Support	Supports policy direction which seeks to avoid or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects in adjoining properties.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P9: Integrated provision of infrastructure	Sheena McGuire	168.72	Support	Supports policy requiring subdivision to connect sites to the public stormwater system where there is capacity or demonstrate there is an alternative means of servicing.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P12: Provision of infrastructure in rural areas	Sheena McGuire	168.73	Support	Supports policy requiring adequate provision of infrastructure in rural areas, particularly stormwater management which can cause a down stream effect for the rail corridor if not managed appropriately.	Retain as proposed	Open Submission

# SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Sheena McGuire	168.74	Support	Supports matter of control 11. Management of potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing land uses.	Retain as proposed	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Sheena McGuire	168.75	Support	Supports matter of control 10. Management of potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing land uses.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Sheena McGuire	168.76	Support	Supports the standard which ensures that lots created by subdivision that do not meet the minimum specified lot size are Non-Complying. Clusters of small lot sizes have the potential to create significant demands on existing infrastructure networks.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Angela McFlynn	169.10	Amend	Considers that requiring that subdivision achieves a minimum average allotment size of 1.5 ha based on the parent allotment in existence as at 11 November 2000 adds unnecessary complexity when determining subdivision potential, and is inconsistent with both the pattern of subdivision consents granted by Council under the Operative District Plan, and the expected character within a rural residential area.	Amend as follows:  <b>SUB-S3: Minimum allotment sizes - rural</b>  Rural Lifestyle Zone, Mission Rural Residential Precinct  5,000 m2 minimum allotment size with a minimum average allotment size of 1.5 ha. The minimum average allotment size must be calculated using the parent allotment in existence as at 11 November 2000. This parent allotment will be the base for any further proposed subdivision.  Activity Status where standards are not met: Non-complying	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Angela McFlynn	169.16	Amend	Considers that lifestyle subdivision where the balance land is amalgamated with neighbouring land is an effective means of increasing the size (and therefore overall productive capacity) of landholdings. Considers that boundary relocations of this nature should therefore be encouraged for small landholdings comprising highly productive land.	<b>Amend to:</b> <b>Where:</b>  1. Subdivision is not on highly productive land; 2. Compliance with standards SUB-S6 - SUB-S18; 3. Allotment size of the lifestyle site is within the range of 2,500 m2 - 5,000 m2 and contains an existing dwelling; 4. Subdivision results in the amalgamation of the balance area with an adjoining site, so that no additional records of title are created by the subdivision; 5. The amalgamated balance of new sites created exceeds 4 ha, and 6. A consent notice is registered on the record of title confirming there will be no further subdivision of the lifestyle allotment created.  <b>SUB-R8B</b> <b>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: Non-complying</b>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.48	Support	Powerco supports this rule which provides for subdivision for network utilities.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O3: Infrastructure, transport, and connectivity	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Towers Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) - Graeme McCarrison	184.1	Support	Supports SUB-O3 as it promotes connectivity and the provision of infrastructure to support subdivision	Retain SUB-O3	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P9: Integrated provision of infrastructure	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Towers Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) - Graeme McCarrison	184.2	Amend	Generally support SUB-P9 except that sub-clause SUB-P9c should be clear that electricity and telecommunication connections are required.	Amend SUB-P9c as follows:  <del>c. enables connects</del> electricity and telecommunications services to be reticulated networks <del>to</del> for each site, and undergrounded in residential and commercial zones where practicable.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Connexa Limited (Connexa), Aotearoa Towers Group (trading as FortySouth), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ) - Graeme McCarrison	184.3	Amend	Considers SUB-S16 fails to recognise that telecommunications connections are inclusive of both fixed line ie fibre and wireless. Acknowledges the need for rural users to have a choice of fixed line or wireless or both, and for urban and rural users to have use services where ever they are. Considers the wireless networks need to have the opportunity to design new network in new developments or grow areas of Napier.	Amend to enable telecommunication connections and requirement for verified assesment of telecommunication provision for each allotment. Refer to orginal submission for suggested wording.	Open Submission

# SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O5: Natural hazards	Angela McFlynn	189.8	Amend	Considers that this provision is inconsistent with the RMA relating to natural hazards, in particular, s6 which requires the management of "significant risk" from natural hazards.	Amend SUB-O5: Natural hazards as follows:  SUB-O5: Natural hazards New subdivision reduces, or does not increase, <del>the</del> <u>any significant</u> risks from natural hazards to people, property, and infrastructure.  Relates to SUB-12, SUB-13.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O6: Subdivision in rural zones	Angela McFlynn	189.9	Amend	Considers that the rural zones include several zones that are not intended nor suitable for productive rural farming activities. The SUB-O6: Subdivision in rural zones Objective should clearly distinguish between the expected predominant use of the Rural Production Zone (RPROZ) for productive farming activities, and the expected predominant use of the other rural zones for residential / rural lifestyle activities.	Amend SUB-O6: Subdivision in rural zones as follows: SUB-O6: Subdivision in rural zones Subdivision of rural land: a. protects highly productive land <u>within the Rural Production Zone</u> ; b. ensures rural lifestyle subdivision is contained within the Rural Lifestyle Zone and avoided within the highly productive land in the Rural <del>Production</del> <u>Productive</u> -Zone, and avoids reverse sensitivity effects between rural activities <u>carried out in the Rural Production Zone</u> and sensitive activities. Relates to SUB-11, SUB-12, SUB-17	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P4: Subdivision design is sympathetic to the landscape	Angela McFlynn	189.10	Oppose	The submitter considers that if this SUB-P4: Subdivision design is sympathetic to the landscape Policy is to be retained, clarity is needed as to what is meant by 'visually prominent areas'. In urban areas it could be argued that any building platform close to the road is visually prominent. Requiring mitigation of any visual effects, whether positive or adverse or the degree of the effect (clause b.) suggests that all roads, access, building platforms etc. must be completely screened from view, which is clearly not practical nor desirable.	Delete SUB-P4: Subdivision design is sympathetic to the landscape in its entirety.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P8: Access and egress	Angela McFlynn	189.11	Amend	The submitter considers with SUB-P8: Access and egress Policy that there is likely to be a conflict between minimising queuing on the road and incorporating shared access in urban areas with large high / medium density developments. Some guidance is requested to be provided as to which should take precedence where such conflicts arise. The Policy encourages shared vehicle access "where appropriate" but provides no guidance regarding when this might be "inappropriate".	Amend SUB-P8: Access and egress Policy to clarify how competing outcomes should be balanced and to provide certainty regarding when shared access might be considered appropriate.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P10: Road reserves	Angela McFlynn	189.12	Amend	Considers that SUB-P10: Road reserves Policy would likely only relate to greenfields subdivisions and as such should be amended accordingly.	Amend SUB-P10: Road reserves as follows:  Require <u>greenfields</u> subdivision to provide sufficient road reserves to accommodate the needs of:...	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P19: Highly productive land	Angela McFlynn	189.13	Amend	Considers that Lifestyle subdivision SUB-P19: Highly productive land where the balance is amalgamated with neighbouring land is an effective means of increasing the size (and therefore the overall productive capacity) of landholdings. Boundary relocations of this nature should therefore be encouraged for small landholdings comprising highly productive land.	Amend SUB-P19: Highly productive land as follows:  Ensure subdivision avoids, if possible, or otherwise mitigates any actual loss or potential cumulative loss of the availability or productive of highly productive land by:  a. providing for the amalgamation of smaller holdings on highly productive land. <del>b. avoiding subdivision for the purpose of rural lifestyle.</del>  ...	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P20: Small lots in rural production zone	Angela McFlynn	189.14	Oppose	Considers for SUB-P20: Small lots in rural production zone that lifestyle subdivision where the balance land is amalgamated with neighbouring land is an effective means of increasing the size (and therefore the overall productive capacity) of landholdings. The creation of lifestyle sites around existing dwellings through boundary relocations should therefore be encouraged for small landholdings comprising highly productive land.	Delete Policy SUB-P20: Small lots in rural production zone in its entirety as notified.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Angela McFlynn	189.15	Amend	Considers that this provision SUB-R2: Boundary adjustment should be extended to boundary relocations generally. The requirements that all lots remain complying, and each site retains any existing dwellings and access are sufficient to ensure that new lots are suitable for their intended / future permitted uses. Limiting the original area to 10% is considered unnecessary.	Amend SUB-R2: Boundary adjustment as follows:  SUB-R2: Boundary <del>adjustment</del> <u>relocation</u>  <b>SUB-R2A</b> <b>Activity Status:</b> Controlled <b>Where:</b> 1. Subdivision involves two or more adjacent sites (which are not separated by any road, rail, river, stream, or watercourse); 2. No new site is created, <del>and no existing site area is changed by more than 10% of its original area;</del> 3. No existing complying lot is rendered non-complying, and no dwelling is severed from its existing site; 4. The adjustment does not result in non-compliance or increase any existing non-compliance with any other rules or standards, and 5. Boundary alterations do not prevent any existing allotment's legal and physical access to a road or limit or interfere with any servicing requirements of any of the sites.	Open Submission

# SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Angela McFlynn	189.16	Amend	The submitter considers that existing cross lease titles contain existing established development. Subdivision of these properties to create freehold titles will not give rise to any change in the existing development or servicing of the land, and therefore compliance with all development standards in SUB-R5: Cross lease title to freehold subdivision should be waived.	Amend SUB-R5: Cross lease title to freehold subdivision as follows: ... <b>Where:</b> 1. Subdivision is to create freehold titles from existing cross lease titles; <del>2. Compliance with SUB S1 – SUB S5 (minimum allotment sizes) does not apply, and 3. Compliance with SUB S6 – SUB S18 does apply.</del>  Matters of control are: 1. The extent to which the new boundaries reflect the existing occupation of each of the existing units. <del>1. Purpose and objectives and policies of the relevant zone, precinct, and development area;</del> <del>2. Safe, connected, and efficient transport network;</del> <del>3. Infrastructure and stormwater;</del> <del>4. Natural hazards and land stability;</del> <del>5. Heritage values;</del> <del>6. Cultural values;</del> <del>7. Landscape and topographical features;</del> <del>8. Natural features and indigenous trees and vegetation;</del> <del>9. Management of construction effects;</del> <del>10. Management of potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing land uses, and</del> <del>11. Subdivision chapter assessment criteria.</del>  <b>SUB-R5B</b> <del>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: Restricted discretionary</del> <del>Matters of discretion are:</del> <del>The matters of control listed for SUB-R5A, and The matters identified in the standards not complied with (SUB S6 – SUB S18).</del>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Angela McFlynn	189.17	Amend	Considers that Lifestyle subdivision where the balance land is amalgamated with neighbouring land (SUB-R8: Subdivision of lifestyle sites within the Productive Rural Zone with amalgamation) is an effective means of increasing the size (and therefore overall productive capacity) of landholdings. Boundary relocations of this nature should therefore be encouraged for small landholdings comprising highly productive land.	Amend SUB-R8: Subdivision of lifestyle sites within the Productive Rural Zone with amalgamation as follows:  SUB-R8: Subdivision of lifestyle sites within the Productive Rural Zone with amalgamation  <b>SUB-R8A</b>  <b>Activity Status:</b> Discretionary  <b>Where:</b> <del>1. Subdivision is not on highly productive land;</del> 2. Compliance with standards SUB-S6 - SUB S18; 3. Allotment size of the lifestyle site is within the range of 2,500 m2 - 5,000 m2 and contains an existing dwelling; 4. Subdivision results in the amalgamation of the balance area with an adjoining site, so that no additional records of title are created by the subdivision; 5. The amalgamated balance of new sites created exceeds 4 ha, and 6. A consent notice is registered on the record of title confirming there will be no further subdivision of the lifestyle allotment created.  <b>SUB-R8B</b>  <b>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met:</b> Non-complying	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Angela McFlynn	189.18	Oppose	Considers it is inappropriate to prevent all subdivision of highly productive land with SUB-R12: Subdivision on highly productive land.	Delete SUB-R12: Subdivision on highly productive land in its entirety.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Angela McFlynn	189.19	Amend	The submitter considers that requiring that subdivision within the Large Lot Residential Zone (LLRZ) in SUB-S1: Minimum allotment sizes - residential Standards Table achieves a minimum average allotment size of 3000m <sup>2</sup> is unnecessary and will prevent the efficient use of the land resource. The most likely outcome from a rule of this nature will be the creation of multiple lots of close to 1000m <sup>2</sup> in size and a large balance site to compensate. The minimum lot size of 1000m <sup>2</sup> would be sufficient to ensure an appropriate density of development while ensuring the efficient use of the available land resource within this zone.	Amend SUB-S1: Minimum allotment sizes - residential as follows:  Large Lot Residential 1,000 m2 minimum allotment size <del>with a minimum average allotment size of 3,000 m2.</del> <b>Activity Status where standards are not met:</b> Non-complying	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Angela McFlynn	189.20	Amend	Considers that requiring that subdivision by way of the Standards achieves a minimum average allotment size of 1.5 ha based on the parent allotment in existence as at 11 November 2000 in SUB-S3: Minimum allotment sizes - rural adds unnecessary complexity when determining subdivision potential and is inconsistent with both the pattern of subdivision consents granted by Council under the Operative District Plan, and the expected character within a rural residential area.	Amend SUB-S3: Minimum allotment sizes - rural as follows:  Rural Lifestyle Zone, Mission Rural Residential Precinct 5,000 m2 minimum allotment size <del>with a minimum average allotment size of 1.5 ha. The minimum average allotment size must be calculated using the parent allotment in existence as at 11 November 2000. This parent allotment will be the base for any further proposed subdivision.</del> <b>Activity Status where standards are not met:</b> Non-complying	Open Submission

# SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Angela McFlynn	189.21	Amend	The submitter considers that there is a risk with SUB-S6: Number of allotments Standard that subdivisions will be undertaken in a piecemeal manner to avoid the change in activity status from Controlled to Restricted Discretionary associated with the creation of four or more sites in a residential zone or 7 or more sites in a rural zone.	Relief sought is not included.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Angela McFlynn	189.22	Amend	Considers that where vacant sites are created, particularly in rural zones, the land may contain multiple potential building platforms with the potential to require earthworks. The submitter believes it is not appropriate in these situations to require details of any earthworks that might be required to create a building platform and access and this will be determined by the design and location of the building at the time of development.	Amend SUB-S8: Building platform as follows:  SUB-S8: Building platform  <b>All zones</b> 1. Each allotment must contain at least one stable, flood-free building platform capable of containing existing and new buildings in compliance with the permitted activity performance standards for the zone where it is located (including building setbacks applicable to that zone), and be suitable for building foundations; <del>2. Details must be provided of the extent and quantum of earthworks required to create a building platform and access.</del> 3. The building platform must be located outside and exclusive of any: Coastal Erosion Hazard Area; significant natural area; public access corridor; archaeological site; land required for access or the disposal of stormwater or wastewater, and highly productive land.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Angela McFlynn	189.23	Oppose	Considers that it is not practical to require detailed stormwater design for any potential future development of a vacant site at the time of subdivision. This can be more appropriately dealt with at the time of building in accordance with the relevant zone provisions.	Delete SUB-S13: Stormwater treatment and disposal Standard in its entirety.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Angela McFlynn	189.24	Amend	Considers the SUB-S17: Indicative public access route Standard should also provide details regarding how compensation will be determined and provided to landowners whose property rights are being affected by the requirement to provide public access through their land.	Amend SUB-S17: Indicative public access route Standard to include details as to how compensation will be provided by Council for the provision of public access easements.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Assessment criteria /SUB-AC5: Shape factor (SUB-S11)	Angela McFlynn	189.26	Amend	Considers this should specify that the assessment criteria only relate to subdivisions where the shape factor standard is not met. Compliance with the shape factor standard itself should be sufficient to achieve these requirements.	Amend SUB-AC5: Shape factor (SUB-S11) as follows:  SUB-AC5: <u>Subdivision not meeting</u> Shape factor <u>standard</u> (SUB-S11)  Relevant zone rules and standards Whether the applicant provides a concept plan demonstrating how sites created are able to accommodate development in accordance with the relevant district wide and zone provisions.  Infrastructure and connectivity The extent to which the site would prevent connectivity with adjoining sites, in particular transport, cycling, pedestrian, and infrastructure servicing.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Assessment criteria /SUB-AC6: Indicative public access route (SUB-S17)	Angela McFlynn	189.27	Amend	Considers that SUB-AC6: Indicative public access route (SUB-S17) assessment criteria should clearly state that they only apply where the relevant standard is not met.	Amend SUB-AC6: Indicative public access route (SUB-S17) as follows:  SUB-AC6: <u>Subdivision not meeting</u> Indicative public access route <u>standard</u> (SUB-S17) a. Whether there are alternative practicable options for alignment of the public access route and the measures to protect these. b. The extent to which future development will ensure there are no impediments to maintaining ongoing public access along the indicative public access route.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Cameron Lloyd	192.1	Amend	Wishes to Amend SUB-S3. Line 2 stating that in Rural Lifestyle relating to subdivision, the minimum lot size is 5000m2, wishes to Amend this to 1000m2. In regard to the property 17 Villers Street Bay view it currently falls under the Rural Residential Zone, in the proposed plan it is set to move to Rural Lifestyle. The property has unique history as it has moved from one title to two.  Within the area the property is surrounded by residential housing. Submitter does not know the reasons why council is discouraging infill development of housing in this area. Feels the rural lifestyle character is not evident, the area has become industrial and has outgrown this designation. States that if sewage is an issue than landowners within the area are prepared to build their own treatment as all want to develop more housing in their titles. The lot size of 5000m2 is too small to be a productive form of agriculture and horticulture. With current housing shortages they expect housing infill would be more achievable.  Under the proposed Rural Lifestyle Zone, they are grouped with smaller property titles yet the lot zone for the proposed zone is 5000m2. If the property on 17 Villers Road can be grouped in the Settlement Zone, then the Rural Lifestyle zone seems to lose its meaning. The point here is that if we are to be categorized as the same as areas which have higher density, then we should have the right to develop residential housing at higher density too.	Seeks to Amend SUB-S3 to make the minimum lot size for Rural Lifestyle Zones 1000m2. Or seeks that the council plans infill developments in Bay View.  Details states in full in the submission.	Open Submission



# SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Cameron Lloyd	194.1	Amend	<p>Wishes to Amend SUB-S3. Line 2 stating that in Rural Lifestyle relating to subdivision, the minimum lot size is 5000m2, wishes to Amend this to 1000m2. In regard to the property 5 Villers Street Bay view it currently falls under the Rural Residential Zone, in the proposed plan it is set to move to Rural Lifestyle. The property has unique history as it has moved from one title to two.</p> <p>Within the area the property is surrounded by residential housing. Submitter does not know the reasons why council is discouraging infill development of housing in this area. Feels the rural lifestyle character is not evident, the area has become industrial and has outgrown this designation. States that if sewage is an issue than landowners within the area are prepared to build their own treatment as all want to develop more housing in their titles. The lot size of 5000m2 is too small to be a productive form of agriculture and horticulture.</p> <p>With current housing shortages they expect housing infill would be more achievable. Under the proposed Rural Lifestyle Zone, they are grouped with smaller property titles yet the lot zone for the proposed zone is 5000m2. If the property on 5 Villers Road can be grouped in the Settlement Zone, then the Rural Lifestyle zone seems to lose its meaning. The point here is that if we are to be categorized as the same as areas which have higher density, then we should have the right to develop residential housing at higher density too.</p>	Seeks to Amend the Rural Lifestyle Zone to make the minimum lot size or 1000m2, or for the council to plan for infill development in the Bay View area.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.14	Amend	As currently drafted, there is no minimum lot size for sites that are partially serviced in the Settlement Zone.	<p>Amend standard as follows:</p> <p>800m<sup>2</sup> Fully Serviced Sites 1500m<sup>2</sup> <del>unserviced</del> other sites</p>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.21	Amend	<p>Standard 1 for the residential zones isn't clear or consistent on how land use standards associated with the zone are addressed e.g. if they need to be approved prior to the subdivision or concurrently.</p> <p>Further, the minimum lot size of 350sqm for vacant lots in the high density residential zone would encourage fragmentation rather than comprehensive site development and is therefore not the most efficient and effective minimum lot size for achieving the purpose of the zone. A minimum lot size of 1200sqm is recommended in this zone, and will encourage amalgamation and high density development rather than infill development.</p>	Amend clauses 1(a) and (b) to enable land use consent for an infringement to non-compliance with standards to be sought either concurrently or through a prior approved land use consent. Amend clause (2) to require a minimum allotment size of 1200m <sup>2</sup> in the high density residential zone for any subdivision that creates new vacant allotments.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.59	Amend	The minimum lot size rule for vacant sites does not apply to sites containing an existing residential unit. However, it needs to be clarified that this exemption does not apply to minor residential units, as these are enabled based on them being ancillary to a primary residential unit on the same site. Subdividing off a minor residential unit could be either enabled under S1(2) if 350sqm, or if under, would need land use consent to "upgrade" it to a full unit complying with all other provisions. Consequential amendments are also proposed to the financial contributions chapter for clarity.	Amend 1(a) so that no minimum lot size only applies to residential units (excluding minor residential units).	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.75	Amend	The current drafting of this rule effectively makes any subdivision more than 10% of an existing site area a discretionary activity, even if the minimum lot size of the zone is met. The intention of the boundary adjustment rule is to enable small adjustments to existing lots as a controlled activity even where not all standards are met. However, where the boundary adjustment is more than 10%, this could be treated as a standard controlled activity subdivision under SUB-R1 if all standards are met.	Add note to SUB-R2B stating that boundary adjustments not meeting SUB-R2A(2) may be considered under either SUB-R1A (if activity standard (1) met), or SUB-R2B.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.76	Amend	The purpose of the shape factor standard is to ensure sites can accommodate development that complies with the standards of the zone. However, it is not clear in the wording of the standard that the shape factor should comply with all applicable standards for the zone e.g. yard setbacks. Further, the shape factor for the high density zone should be larger to accommodate the intended typologies sought by the zone objectives.	<p>Amend the standard as follows (or similar relief):</p> <p>SUB-S11: Shape factor High density residential zone (HDRZ) <u>1. All vacant sites must be able to contain a rectangle of 15m x 20m that complies with all applicable standards of the zone.</u></p> <p>All other zones <u>2. All vacant sites must be able to contain a rectangle of 8 m by 15m that complies with all applicable standards of the zone.</u></p>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Assessment criteria /SUB-AC1: General, applies to all subdivision (including boundary adjustments)	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.77	Amend	The current wording in the introduction to the assessment criteria states that the criteria become matters of control or discretion for CA and RDA activities. This is not correct in the context of the proposed District Plan – the relevant matters of control or discretion are set out in the rules and standards. Further, the assessment criteria for subdivision apply to all activities including discretionary and non-complying as they provide additional guidance on the relevant effects to be assessed.	<p>Amend wording as follows:</p> <p>In assessing all applications for subdivision, Council will have regard to the following assessment criteria. <del>The assessment criteria are to be considered as matters of control for the assessment of controlled activity subdivisions and matters of discretion for all restricted-discretionary activity subdivisions.</del></p>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Mike Doesburg	209.4	Oppose	Considers that the SETZ-S1: Density standard in the Settlement Zone should be consistent with the Subdivision Chapter. Please refer to the relief sought in relation to SETZ-S1.	Amend SUB-S3 as follows: Settlement Zone <del>800</del> 350 m2 fully serviced sites 1500m2 unserviced sites	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Guy Panckhurst	210.1	Amend	Submitter wants to amend SUB-R5. For activity to remain a controlled activity it needs to comply with SUB-S6 to SUB-S18. In the majority of cases the cross leases involve existing buildings with defined restrictive use areas and access arrangements. Many of SUB-S6 to SUB-S18 standards are not relevant to this situation. Many of the matters of control are not relevant to this situation either.	<p>Seeks to amend applicable standards and matters of control to only address issues that need assessing.</p> <p>Seeks to delete the infrastructure requirement that the water supplies need to be completely separate.</p> <p>Reasons are given in detail in the full submission.</p>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Guy Panckhurst	210.2	Amend	It is acknowledged that all allotments should have practical vehicle access, but there are sometimes instances when it is not practical to provide a physical access because other works need to occur first, or installing a crossing may result in damage during subsequent building construction activities.	<p>Seeks to acknowledge the situations and allow vehicle crossings to be deferred to the time of Building Consent.</p> <p>Refer to original submission for full reason.</p>	Open Submission

# SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Guy Panckhurst	210.3	Amend	Considers the wording of SUB-S16 doesn't make it clear if power/gas/telecommunications connections need to be made.  Electricity connections should be made available in urban zones, questions why connections are required in rural zones? States this is an added cost that is unjustified and sometimes not required.  There are alternatives other than fibre telecommunication cables for urban sites. Fibre network connection should not be a role of the council to dictate.	Seeks to clarify what utility services are required and which are to be physically installed.  Seeks to remove the requirement for electricity connections on rural sites at the time of subdivision.  Seeks to remove the requirement to provide telecommunications connections at the time of subdivision.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P9: Integrated provision of infrastructure	Guy Panckhurst	210.6	Amend	Considers that electricity should not be required rural sites. Telecommunications should not be required for rural and infill sites. Other options are available for both electricity and telecommunications.	Seeks to remove requirement electricity on rural sites and telecommunications on rural and infill sites.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Guy Panckhurst	210.8	Amend	It is not clear what "allotment size" means, as it is not defined anywhere. Presumably it means the legal area of the allotment, since there is no mention of net site area.	Seeks to Clarify exactly what is meant by "allotment size".	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Guy Panckhurst	210.10	Amend	Considers the allotment size of 5000m2 appropriate but the blanket 1.5ha minimum average is too large. There are many sites that could support an area of less than 1.5ha. development in the hills off the Heretaunga plains should be encouraged. there are areas already zoned as rural lifestyle that could support higher densities. there are already noncomplying applications being approved in this zone.	Seeks to have more investigation as to which areas in the rural residential zones could support higher densities, and re-zone these areas, or allow subdivision as a discretionary or restricted discretionary activity.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Guy Panckhurst	210.11	Amend	Considers the minimum allotment size of 350m2 under (2) provided no flexibility for two lot infill subdivision when, due to site constraints, either the lot containing the existing dwelling, or the vacant allotment cannot achieve 350m2. This standard could prevent many potential infill subdivisions from occurring.  Under 1(b) (ii) there would be an issue under a staged subdivision where some vacant titles are created pending development of dwellings on the next stage. A staged subdivision development would likely not be able to comply with this standard and could compromise funding and cashflow for the next stages. Rather than 1(b)(ii) mandating no vacant allotments, why not ensure that any future building development cannot occur on the vacant allotment unless it is in accordance with the land use consent granted, which could be secured by way of Consent Notice.	Seeks to reduce minimum lot size to 300m2.  Seeks to remove the minimum size for allotments containing dwellings. Seeks to allow allotments to be created under staged subdivision consents.  Reasons are stated in detail in the full submission.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Guy Panckhurst	210.12	Amend	Considers the standard says there must be a "flood free" building platform, what exactly does this mean? There are many areas in Napier that are potentially susceptible to flooding in certain AEP storms. On new sites the potential flooding hazard is mitigated by setting floor levels that are above the flood level.	Seeks to have the wording of flood free revisited.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Chorus New Zealand Limited - Andrew Kantor	212.1	Amend	Supports the intent of SUB-S16 to ensure network utility services are provided during subdivision however seeks to amend SUB-S16 or to create an additional standard to mandate connection to an open-access fibre network at the time of subdivision. Considers that access to high-quality broadband is crucial for work, education, and lifestyle, hence fiber connection should be treated as an essential service alongside water supply and wastewater. Failure to provide fiber during subdivision can lead to disruptive retroactive installations, increased costs, and inefficiencies. Seeks relief to ensure consistency with other subdivision standards while allowing flexibility for alternative telecommunications connections under certain circumstances.	Add standard as below:  <u>SUB-SXX: Telecommunications</u> <u>1. Alternative supply of telecommunications services</u>  <u>All general residential, commercial and industrial zones, precincts, and control areas</u> <u>- 1. All new allotments created must be connected to an open-access fibre network</u>  <u>Matters of discretion: 1. Alternative supply of telecommunications services</u>  <u>Rural zones, precincts, and control areas</u> <u>1. All new allotments created must have the ability to connect to a telecommunications network (fibre, mobile or wireless including satellite)</u>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Issues /SUB-I5: The need to ensure public access to the coast, estuary, and rivers	Amelia Longley	222.7	Support	SUB-I5 protects and provides for the development Public Access.	Retain provided the proposed additions to the Indicative Public Access Routes layer is accepted.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O2: Impact of the built environment on landscapes, biodiversity, water quality, and other key environmental matters	Amelia Longley	222.8	Support	SUB-O2 includes provision for consideration of impacts of subdivision on public open space.	Retain SUB-O2	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P11: Esplanade reserves and public access	Amelia Longley	222.9	Support	SUB-P11 ensures provision for identified public access.	Seeks to Retain SUB-P11.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Amelia Longley	222.10	Support	SUB-S17 supports protection and development of public access.	Retain, provided proposed additions to Indicative Public Access Routes are accepted.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Assessment criteria /SUB-AC6: Indicative public access route (SUB-S17)	Amelia Longley	222.11	Support	SUB-AC6 provides for development of indicative public access routes.	Retain, provided additions to Indicative Public Access routes are accepted.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O3: Infrastructure, transport, and connectivity	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.29	Support	The Ministry supports this objective as it requires subdivisions to provide safe, efficient and accessible connectivity and active modes of transport. The Ministry supports the uptake of students choosing active modes of travel to schools as it has health benefits and reduces traffic congestion on the road network at peak pick up and drop off time.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P7: Providing for connectivity	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.30	Support	Supports this policy to enable well connected neighbourhoods through the active and public transport modes. The ministry supports the uptake of students choosing active modes. Supports the uptake of students choosing active modes of travel to schools as it has health benefits and reduces traffic congestion on the road network at peak pick up and drop off times.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table /	Peter Holley	235.3	Amend	Amendments are sought to Subdivision Standards SUB-S5 and SUB-S18 as a consequence of the requested new Mission Church Road Residential Precinct. The specific reasons are set out in the S32 Report attached to this submission (a summary of which can be found in submission point 235.2). The specific amendments to be made to each standard and the reasons for these requested changes can be found in submission points 235.16 and 235.17.	Amendments to SUB-S5 and SUB-S18 as set out in the attached document SUB - Subdivision - MHGL Submission.pdf, the details of which can be found in submission points 235.16 and 235.17.	Open Submission

# SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Peter Holley	235.16	Amend	Amendments are sought to Subdivision Standards SUB-55 as a consequence of the requested new Mission Church Road Residential Precinct. The reasons given for requesting changes are summarised in submission point 235.2.	Amend SUB-55 Minimum allotments sizes - Development Areas as follows: <b>SUB-55 Minimum allotments sizes - Development areas</b> Mission Development Area No minimum (550 houses required in the Mission Residential Precinct) <u>Activity status where standards are not met: N/A</u>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Peter Holley	235.17	Amend	Amendments are sought to Subdivision Standards SUB-518 as a consequence of the requested new Mission Church Road Residential Precinct. The specific reasons are set out in the S32 Report and are summarised in submission point 235.2..	Amend SUB-518 Esplanade Reserves as follows:  <b>Mission Development Area</b> Purpose: to consider the safety of the public when restricting access through a working vineyard.  1. There is no esplanade reserve requirement for the Taipo Stream where it traverses <del>the Mission Special Character Zone</del> land within the Mission Development Area except in the following circumstances: a. a 20m esplanade reserve must be vested in Council for land comprised in (either Lot 1 DP 27138 held in Certificate of Title W3/453 W1/63 and/or Part Lot 2 DP25932 held in Certificate of Title HBW1/63 (as at 12 September 2018) which falls within the Mission Productive Rural, and/or Mission Landscape & Visitor, and/or Mission Church Road Rural Residential (fronting Church Road). Precincts where sites of less than 4ha are created wholly or partly within 100m of the Taipo Stream. b. No esplanade reserve will be required for sites created through subdivision within the Mission Residential Precinct and the Rural Residential Precinct which adjoins the Residential Precinct.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O3: Infrastructure, transport, and connectivity	Angela Jones	240.11	Amend	Considers that it is unclear what 'established network utilities' refers to. If the intent is to reference only existing, established network utilities, including existing electricity distribution, this should be clarified. Considers it necessary for the PDP to be future focussed and subdivisions should be required to confirm there is sufficient network capacity available for utility services that will serve the development. seeks for the objective to be amended to recognise that it is necessary for subdivision to be supported by development infrastructure and additional infrastructure for both existing and anticipated future activities.	Amend the objective as follows: SUB-O3: Infrastructure, transport, and connectivity  a. subdivision has a layout that is: i. safe, efficient, convenient, accessible, enhances connectivity and encourages active transport modes, and ii. resilient and integrates with existing communities and provides for the long-term needs of its residents. b. infrastructure supporting subdivision and development is planned and provided for in an integrated and comprehensive manner at the time of subdivision. c. land is vested at the time of subdivision to provide for high-quality reserves, esplanade reserves, roads, stormwater, access and other purposes for the benefit of the wider community. d. subdivision protects the operation and access to established <u>and planned</u> network utilities and regionally significant infrastructure while mitigating reserve sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P9: Integrated provision of infrastructure	Angela Jones	240.12	Amend	Considers that it is unclear what 'established network utilities' refers to. If the intent is to reference only existing, established network utilities, including existing electricity distribution, this should be clarified. Considers it necessary for the PDP to be future focussed and subdivisions should be required to confirm there is sufficient network capacity available for utility services that will serve the development. Seeks for the policy to be amended to recognise that it is necessary for subdivision to be supported by development infrastructure and additional infrastructure for both existing and anticipated future activities.	Amend the policy as follows: Require subdivision to provide servicing that meets the requirements of the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure and that: a. is coordinated, integrated, and compatible with the existing <u>and planned</u> infrastructure network. b. enables the existing network to be expanded or extended to adjacent land in the future where that land is zoned or identified through a future urban development strategy for urban development, and especially through the avoidance of allotments created primarily for the purpose of preventing connectivity to adjacent sites (spite strips). c. enables electricity and telecommunications services to be reticulated to each site, and undergrounded in residential and commercial zones where practicable. <u>d. provide utility reserves where necessary to position new infrastructure to service large lot subdivision.</u> e. connects sites capable of containing a building, in areas where service connections to the public network are available and capacity exists, to the following networks: i. wastewater; ii. stormwater, and iii. potable water. unless it is demonstrated that an alternative means of servicing can be provided meeting legislative and acceptable environmental outcomes.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Angela Jones	240.13	Amend	Supports the standard requiring the provision for utility services within a subdivision but considers the standard needs to be amended to include measurable criteria. Seeks more specific details about the size or location of land for utility services in a subdivision be stated in the standard. Submitter is concerned with large subdivisions that do not set aside utility reserves and is also concerned with subdivisions that rely on provision for utility services in road reserve, the approval of which is outside the submitters control.	Amend the standard to include measurable criteria for the size and location of land for utility services.	Open Submission

# SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table /General	Angela Jones	240.14	Amend	Considers that the electricity distribution network is critical to the economic and social well-being of Napier residents, and therefore it is imperative developments encroaching nationally within recognised electrical safety standards should trigger the need for resource consent. Seeks the inclusion of a standard that specifically requires a setback from the electricity distribution network, as is proposed under SUB-S9 for the National Grid and SUB-S10 for the gas transmission network.	Include a new standard: SUB-Sxx – Building platforms within proximity of the electricity distribution network: <u>1. The subdivision of land in any zone containing the electricity distribution network must be able to demonstrate that all resulting allotments are capable of accommodating a building platform for the likely principal building(s) and any building(s) for a sensitive activity that is at least 10 m from the underground electricity distribution network and 20 m from above-ground equipment forming part of the electricity distribution network.</u> <u>2. The layout of allotments and any enabling earthworks must ensure that physical access is maintained to the electricity distribution network support structures where it is located on the allotments, including any balance area.</u> Matters of discretion: <u>1. Ability to comply with relevant zone rules and standards.</u> <u>2. Infrastructure and connectivity.</u> Consequential amendments to relevant rules in the Subdivision chapter are also sought.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Issues /General	Phil Stickney	247.3	Amend	Consider amendments to this section of The Plan as it is considered that in some instances, the approach to subdivision does not align well with the provisions of Policy 6 in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020; that Policy recognising the changing character in communities through ongoing urban development.	Amend the sections to clearly reflect the intent of Policy 6 of the NPS-UD 2020 in the context of subdivision.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /General	Phil Stickney	247.4	Oppose	Considers that there is significant repetition of issues and confusing terminology which does not assist in clarity and useability of the Plan. The effectiveness of the provisions is significantly diluted through this current structure and are considered to be too vague to provide clear guidance.	Amend to provide clarity and clear guidance on key matters and amending text to reflect appropriate management of effects as that term is defined within s.3 of The Act.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Phil Stickney	247.6	Oppose	Opposes the discretionary activity status of a proposed subdivision activity that fails to achieve all performance standards.	Amend the status of a proposed subdivision activity that fails to achieve all performance standards to restricted discretionary.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Phil Stickney	247.7	Oppose	Opposes a discretionary activity status for proposed subdivision activities that fail to achieve all performance standards.	Amend the status of a proposed subdivision activity that fails to achieve all performance standards to restricted discretionary.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Phil Stickney	247.8	Oppose	Opposes the provisions of SUB-R1A and SUB-R2A and SUB-R5 as that standard seeks reserves control over the Purpose, Objectives and Policies of the relevant Zone, Precinct and Development Area.	Amend to remove reference to (1) in SUB-R1A and SUB-R2A and SUB-R5.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Phil Stickney	247.9	Oppose	Opposes the provisions of SUB-R1A and SUB-R2A and SUB-R5 as that standard seeks reserves control over the Purpose, Objectives and Policies of the relevant Zone, Precinct and Development Area.	Amend to remove reference to (1) in SUB-R1A and SUB-R2A and SUB-R5.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Phil Stickney	247.10	Oppose	Opposes the provisions of SUB-R1A and SUB-R2A and SUB-R5 as that standard seeks reserves control over the Purpose, Objectives and Policies of the relevant Zone, Precinct and Development Area.	Delete reference to (1) in SUB-R1A and SUB-R2A and SUB-R5.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Phil Stickney	247.11	Oppose	Opposes the non-complying category being applied to SUB-S1.	Amend SUB-S1 to provide for a restricted discretionary activity status.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Phil Stickney	247.12	Oppose	Oppose the vacant lot subdivision standard set out in SUB-S1 as it does not distinguish between the GRZ and MRZ vacant site subdivision standards. It is reasonable for a differentiation in standards for these zones as a vacant site area of 250sqm is entirely appropriate within which to design and develop a complying townhouse at a density which better reflects the intent of the MRZ outcomes in contrast to the GRZ.	Amend SUB-S1 to reflect a vacant site net site area of 250sqm for the MRZ.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Phil Stickney	247.13	Oppose	Consider recognising the Riverbend Road Development Area within Rule SUB-S5	Amend to include the Riverbend Road Development Area to the provisions of SUB-S5.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Phil Stickney	247.14	Oppose	Opposes this standard as the inference of this rule is to limit the number of sites that can be created before a proposal default to a more arduous consent category.	Delete SUB-S6.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Phil Stickney	247.15	Oppose	Opposes the introduction of a shape factor in SUB-S11 as that does not distinguish between MRZ and GRZ typologies and also conflicts with the provisions of SUB-S1 which requires a demonstration that a dwelling can be built that complies with the relevant standards.	Delete SUB-S11.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Assessment criteria /SUB-AC1: General, applies to all subdivision (including boundary adjustments)	Phil Stickney	247.16	Oppose	Opposes the provisions of SUB-AC1 as (a) reserves control over the Purpose, Objectives and Policies of the relevant Zone, Precinct and Development Area.	Amend SUB-AC1 to remove (a) and reconfigure the balance of the provisions.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Assessment criteria /SUB-AC2: Subdivision of three sites or more in residential, rural, commercial, and industrial zones (Number of allotments created SUB-S6)	Phil Stickney	247.17	Oppose	Opposes the provisions of SUB-AC2 as (a) reserves control over the Purpose, Objectives and Policies of the relevant Zone, Precinct and Development Area.	Delete SUB-AC2(a)	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Assessment criteria /SUB-AC8: All infringements to standards (SUB-S1 - SUB-S18)	Phil Stickney	247.18	Oppose	Opposes SUB-AC8 as it is not an appropriate provision as currently drafted as it partially applies a test in (c) that is applicable only to a non-complying activity under The Act and is onerous for a subdivision which infringes a standard in SUB-S1 -SUB-S18. It adds no substantive guidance to an assessment of an application.	Delete SUB-AC8.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Darryl Wayne Hook	248.2	Oppose	Considers the rules relating to subdivision and minimum site area (2,500m <sup>2</sup> ) should apply to all properties within the Rural Lifestyle Zone. There is a rule that only permits further site as a result of subdivision at 135 Ballantyne Road which is 5.4ha in area.	Seeks that all properties within this subdivision have RLZ-R3a minimum site area of 2,500 m <sup>2</sup> .	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Alan White	249.10	Support	Support the Council's approach to Esplanade Reserves along the Taipo Stream. This stream is managed without any pumping assistance and is approaching its maximum capacity. While the February 2023 cyclone did not have major impact on Knightsbridge and downstream, the November 2020 certainly did, with significant flooding around Taipo Stream. Any "infill" subdivision does need to factor in the increased hard surface areas associated with developments and future situations should be notified to allow existing landowners to have the opportunity to make comment and express any concerns on the proposals.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Assessment criteria /SUB-AC4: Subdivision not meeting building platform standard (SUB-S8)	Trevor Ellis	253.51	Oppose	The assessment criteria for Subdivision not meeting building platform standard (SUB-S8) includes a heading for ecological values but does not provide any criteria.	seeks to insert ecological values in the assessment criteria.	Open Submission

# SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /Issues /SUB-I7: Issues of reverse sensitivity on adjacent land uses	Leanne Roberts	257.35	Amend	HortNZ supports recognition of reverse sensitivity on adjacent land uses. This is a key issue in rural areas and primary production.  Suggests amending as mitigation measures should also include setbacks.	Seeks to amend SUB-I7 to include setbacks:  Mitigation measures such as planting buffers, site layout <u>and setbacks</u> should be considered and incorporated at the time of subdivision where potential for reverse sensitivity exists.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O1: Compatible land use	Leanne Roberts	257.36	Support	HortNZ supports the need for compatible land uses.	Seeks to retain SUB-O1 Compatible land use.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O6: Subdivision in rural zones	Leanne Roberts	257.37	Amend	HortNZ supports Objective 6 to protect highly productive land, avoiding Rural lifestyle in the Rural Production Zone and avoiding reverse sensitivity effects. However the objective refers to 'rural activities' which are not defined.	Seeks to amend SUB-O6 to: b) Rural Production Zone (not productive) c) Delete rural activities and replace with <u>primary production activities and rural industry</u> .  alternatively define rural activities as primary production activities, rural industry and activities that have a functional need to locate in the Rural Production Zone.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P1: Compatible land use	Leanne Roberts	257.38	Support	Method to address reverse sensitivity are supported.	Seeks to retain SUB-P1 Compatible land use.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P19: Highly productive land	Leanne Roberts	257.39	Amend	Considers the policy needs to more accurately reflect the NPSHPL.	Seeks to amend SUB-P13 as follows:  Amend c): Avoiding subdivision unless Section 3.8 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022 is met. Amend d) by deleting subpoints ii, iii, and iv as these are included in Section 3.10 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P20: Small lots in rural production zoneLand fragmentation and/or the creation of allotments for residential and rural lifestyle activities are to be avoided.	Leanne Roberts	257.40	Support	Considers land fragmentation should be avoided.	Seeks to retain SUB-P20 Small lots in rural production zone.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Leanne Roberts	257.41	Amend	HortNZ does not support a controlled activity status for subdivision in the Rural Production Zone as it does not enable affected parties to be involved in the process which may adversely affect their operations.	Seeks to amend SUB-R1A to Restricted Discretionary in the Rural Production Zone and Discretionary where standards are not met.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Leanne Roberts	257.42	Support	A non-complying activity status gives effects to National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022.	Seeks to retain SUB-R12 Subdivision on highly productive land.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Leanne Roberts	257.43	Amend	A minimum lot size of 4ha in the Rural Production Zone is supported.	Seeks to amend Rural <del>Productive</del> Zone to Rural <u>Production</u> Zone.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Assessment criteria /SUB-AC1: General, applies to all subdivision (including boundary adjustments)	Leanne Roberts	257.44	Amend	Considers clause aa) should apply to all primary production activities not just land-based primary production activities.	Seeks to amend by deleting <del>land-based</del> primary production.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Issues /General	Phil Stickney	263.4	Amend	Generally supports the proposed Introduction and the Issues framework (contained within SUB-I1 – SUB-I8) subject to some amendments and refinements to aid in useability, clarity, and consistency of terminology. The Submitter seeks some amendments to this section of the Plan as it is considered that in some instances, the approach to subdivision does not align well with the provisions of Policy 6 in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020; that Policy recognising the changing character in communities through ongoing urban development.	Amend the sections to clearly reflect the intent of Policy 6 of the NPS-UD 2020 in the context of subdivision.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /General	Phil Stickney	263.5	Oppose	Opposes objectives and policies. There is significant repetition of issues and confusing terminology which does not assist in clarity and useability of the Plan. The effectiveness of the provisions is significantly diluted through this current structure and are considered to be too vague to provide clear guidance.	Seeks amendments to provide clarity and clear guidance on key matters and amending text to reflect appropriate management of effects as that term is defined within s.3 of The Act.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /General	Phil Stickney	263.6	Oppose	Opposes Subdivision objectives and policies. There is significant repetition of issues and confusing terminology which does not assist in clarity and useability of the Plan. The effectiveness of the provisions is significantly diluted through this current structure and are considered to be too vague to provide clear guidance.	Seeks amendments to provide clarity and clear guidance on key matters and amending text to reflect appropriate management of effects as that term is defined within s.3 of The Act.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Phil Stickney	263.7	Oppose	Amendments to SUB-R2B and SUB—R4B are sought as there is no substantive rationale for the inclusion of a discretionary activity consenting category against an activity which fails to meet all the relevant standards. An amended consent category still provides Council with the ability to consider relevant matters and decline if it sees fit to do so but focuses on salient matters rather than a wide-ranging assessment. It is appropriate for a proposal to fall from Controlled to Restricted Discretionary but the default to Discretionary is not considered justified in many instances.	Amend the consent activity categories to reflect a more logical cascade of consenting status depending upon the nature of the subdivision and the standards that may not be achieved.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Phil Stickney	263.8	Oppose	Amendments to SUB-R2B and SUB—R4B are sought as there is no substantive rationale for the inclusion of a discretionary activity consenting category against an activity which fails to meet all the relevant standards. The amended consent category still provides Council with the ability to consider relevant matters and decline if it sees fit to do so but focuses on salient matters rather than a wide-ranging assessment. It is appropriate for a proposal to fall from Controlled to Restricted Discretionary but the default to Discretionary is not considered justified in many instances.	Amend the consent activity categories to reflect a more logical cascade of consenting status depending upon the nature of the subdivision and the standards that may not be achieved.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Phil Stickney	263.9	Oppose	Oppose SUB-R1A, SUB-R2A and SUB-R5 as that standard seeks to reserve control over the Purpose, Objectives and Policies of the relevant Zone, Precinct and Development Area. If an activity is Controlled by the zone or other standards, it must inherently be considered to be envisaged by the Objectives and Policies and as such the need for control over that matter is considered redundant.	Remove reference to (1) in SUB-R1A, SUB-R2A and SUB-R5.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Phil Stickney	263.10	Oppose	Opposes SUB-R1A, SUB-R2A and SUB-R5 as that standard seeks to reserve control over the Purpose, Objectives and Policies of the relevant Zone, Precinct and Development Area. If an activity is Controlled by the zone or other standards, it must inherently be considered to be envisaged by the Objectives and Policies and as such the need for control over that matter is considered redundant.	Remove reference to (1) in SUB-R1A, SUB-R2A and SUB-R5.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Phil Stickney	263.11	Oppose	Opposes SUB-R1A, SUB-R2A and SUB-R5 as that standard seeks to reserve control over the Purpose, Objectives and Policies of the relevant Zone, Precinct and Development Area. If an activity is Controlled by the zone or other standards, it must inherently be considered to be envisaged by the Objectives and Policies and as such the need for control over that matter is considered redundant.	Remove reference to (1) in SUB-R1A, SUB-R2A and SUB-R5.	Open Submission

# SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Phil Stickney	263.12	Oppose	Opposes the non-complying category of SUB-S1. The matters at issue are considered to be able to be managed through a Restricted Discretionary activity status.  SUB-S1 is opposed. The vacant lot subdivision standard set out in SUB-S1 does not distinguish between the GRZ and MRZ vacant site subdivision standards. It is reasonable for a differentiation in standards for these zones as a vacant site area of 250sqm is entirely appropriate within which to design and develop a complying townhouse at a density which better reflects the intent of the MRZ outcomes in contrast to the GRZ.	Amend SUB-S1 to give effect to the relief sought. Amend SUB-S1 to reflect a vacant site net site area of 250sqm for the MRZ.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Phil Stickney	263.13	Oppose	Amend SUB-S2 as there is no resource management rationale for having no control over subdivision (by way of a minimum lot area) within Commercial and Industrial Zones but conversely imposing a minimum of 2500sqm for subdivision undertaken within the LFRZ. In all these zones, the nature of the intended land use will dictate the size of the lot required and the land use standards for the LFRZ are already well regulated through the zoning provisions.	Delete the 2500sqm provision in respect of LFRZ subdivision in SUB-R2.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Phil Stickney	263.14	Amend	Recognition of the Wharerangi Development Area within Rule SUB-S5 is sought, as that area is not clearly identified and it is noted that SUB-S5 currently enables the Mission Development Area and Te Awa Development Area amongst others to benefit from a "no minimum" lot area approach to subdivision. The Submitter seeks an amendment to reflect the same standards be applicable to the Wharerangi Development Area identified in APP-10.	Add reference to the DEV-2 (Wharerangi Development Area) into the standards in SUB-S5.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Phil Stickney	263.15	Oppose	Removal of SUB-S6 is sought, as the inference of this rule is to limit the number of sites that can be created before a proposal default to a more arduous consent category. There is no link or caveat in respect of multi-unit development subdivision or other activities which might justify the existence of the rule. In the absence of a clear rationale as to why this rule is necessary and what effect or resource management issue it purports to regulate; The Submitter seeks the deletion of these rules. If a subdivision proposal complies with all relevant standards, it is unclear as to why this rule overrides the other activity standards.	Delete SUB-S6.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Phil Stickney	263.16	Oppose	Opposes the introduction of a shape factor in SUB-S11 as that does not distinguish between MRZ and GRZ typologies and also conflicts with the provisions of SUB-S1 which requires a demonstration that a dwelling can be built that complies with the relevant standards. The imposition of a blanket shape factor renders the outcome inflexible and not reflective of higher density development.	Delete SUB-S11.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Assessment criteria /SUB-AC1: General, applies to all subdivision (including boundary adjustments)	Phil Stickney	263.17	Oppose	Opposes SUB-AC1 as (a) reserves control over the Purpose, Objectives and Policies of the relevant Zone, Precinct and Development Area. If an activity is Controlled or Restricted Discretionary by the zone or other standards, it must inherently be considered to be envisaged by the Objectives and Policies and as such the need for the inclusion of this provision is considered redundant. There is additional terminology used in the balance of the provisions which does not correlate with resource management terminology and does not provide clarity and conciseness for users of the Plan.	Amend SUB-AC1 to remove (a) and reconfigure the balance of the provisions.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Assessment criteria /SUB-AC2: Subdivision of three sites or more in residential, rural, commercial, and industrial zones (Number of allotments created SUB-S6)	Phil Stickney	263.18	Oppose	Seeks the deletion of SUB-AC2. This is effectively addressing the same issues as that for all other subdivisions. It is considered unnecessary and not a provision that adds to the robustness or quality of an assessment of subdivision.	Delete SUB-AC2.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Assessment criteria /SUB-AC8: All infringements to standards (SUB-S1 - SUB-S18)	Phil Stickney	263.19	Oppose	SUB-AC8 is not an appropriate provision as currently drafted as it partially applies a test in (c) that is applicable only to a non-complying activity under The Act and is onerous for a subdivision which infringes a standard in SUB-S1 -SUB-S18. It adds no substantive guidance to an assessment of an application.	Delete SUB-AC8.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O2: Impact of the built environment on landscapes, biodiversity, water quality, and other key environmental matters	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.143	Support	HNZPT supports SUB - Subdivision Objective SUB-O2: Impacts of the built environment on landscapes, biodiversity, water quality, and other key environmental matters as the Objective refers to the protection and maintenance of historic heritage and is therefore supported.	Retain SUB - Subdivision Objective SUB-O2: Impacts of the built environment on landscapes, biodiversity, water quality, and other key environmental matters as notified.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O4: Cultural values.	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.144	Support	Supports Objective SUB-O4: Cultural values as it refers to the recognition and incorporation of cultural values and is therefore supported.	Retain Objective SUB-O4: Cultural values as notified.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O8: Historic heritage overlays and precincts	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.145	Amend	Considers this Objective which requires subdivision to provide for the protection of historic heritage overlays and precincts is supported. However, the Objective wording should also be amended to extend to the subdivision of sites containing historic heritage buildings and structures.	Amend SUB-O8: Historic heritage overlays and precincts as follows:  Historic Heritage overlays and precincts <u>and sites containing historic heritage items</u>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P14: Incorporating cultural values	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.146	Support	Supports SUB - Subdivision Policy SUB-P14: Incorporating cultural values as HNZPT supports the intent of this policy to incorporate cultural values into subdivisions.	Retain Policy SUB-P14: Incorporating cultural values as notified.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P17: Conservation sites	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.147	Support	Supports SUB-P17: Conservation sites as HNZPT supports the intent of this policy to provide for conservation sites.	Retain Policy SUB-P17: Conservation sites as notified.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P18: Historic heritage overlays and precincts	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.148	Amend	Considers that while the intent of SUB-P18: Historic heritage overlays and precincts is supported so there is consistency with the established pattern of development, it requires amending as the reference to objective SUB-O3 is incorrect.	Retain Policy SUB-P18: Historic heritage overlays and precincts, with the following amendment:  <del>Relates to SUB-O3-SUB-O8</del>	Open Submission

# SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /General /General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.149	Amend	Considers an additional Policy is required which explicitly identifies requirements for the subdivision of land containing a scheduled building and Site of Significance to Māori (SOSM), other than for the purpose of creating Conservation Lots. This amendment would assist in achieving Objective SUB-08 and the Policy would help support a new recommended rule, which allows for more effective control over subdivision in these areas.	Insert New Subdivision Policy as follows:  <u>Only allow subdivision of sites containing scheduled heritage items or Sites of Significance to Māori where it can be demonstrated that the values of the scheduled item can be maintained and there is sufficient land provided around the scheduled place to protect associated cultural and heritage values.</u>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.150	Support	Considers that while SUB - Subdivision Rule SUB-R1: Subdivision as a Rule is supported, Controlled Activity status is not as it must be granted even if subdivision has an adverse effect on existing heritage values. Restricted Discretionary Activity status is instead proposed as a new Rule for the subdivision of sites containing scheduled heritage items.	Retain a SUB - Subdivision Rule SUB-R1: Subdivision Rule.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.151	Support	Supports Rule SUB-R4: Subdivision to create conservation lots for the protection of scheduled heritage items, archaeological sites, and/or sites of significance to Māori which provides for the creation of conservation lots. The Controlled activity status is appropriate for this situation.	Retain Rule SUB-R4: Subdivision to create conservation lots for the protection of scheduled heritage items, archaeological sites, and/or sites of significance to Māori as notified.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.152	Support	Supports Rule SUB-R9: Subdivision of land containing site of significance to Māori while noting that the SOSM chapter and related provisions have not yet been finalised.	Seeks to have the SOSM chapter and related provisions finalised.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table /General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.153	Amend	Considers SUB - Subdivision Rule SUB-R1: Subdivision as a Controlled Activity is inappropriate as this activity status does not allow the Council to decline resource consent should subdivision have an adverse effect on existing heritage values. An amendment in the form of a new Rule is required with a Restricted Discretionary Activity status for subdivision of sites containing scheduled heritage items.	Amend SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table with a new Rule which manages subdivision on a site containing a scheduled heritage item as follows:  <u>SUB-RX</u> <u>Subdivision of a site containing a historic heritage item included in SCHED3.</u> <u>Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Matters of discretion:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• effect of subdivision on heritage or cultural values</li><li>• whether sufficient land is provided around the scheduled heritage item</li><li>• any measures proposed to reduce or mitigate potential effects.</li><li>• Any positive effects arising from subdivision</li></ul>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Assessment criteria /SUB-AC1: General, applies to all subdivision (including boundary adjustments)	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.154	Support	HNZPT supports SUB-AC1: General, applies to all subdivision (including boundary adjustments) as the matters of consideration are considered generally appropriate.	Retain SUB-AC1: General, applies to all subdivision (including boundary adjustments) as notified.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O1: Compatible land use	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.59	Support	Supports O1 as it provides for reverse sensitivity effects to be avoided or mitigated.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O3: Infrastructure, transport, and connectivity	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.60	Support	Supports O3 as it provides for safe and efficient active modes of transport, that infrastructure is planned and provided for to support subdivision and development, and subdivision protects the operation and access to established network utilities and regionally significant infrastructure while mitigating reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O6: Subdivision in rural zones	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.61	Amend	Supports in part O6, but considers a new point should be added to avoid reverse sensitivity effects between subdivisions in rural areas and established activities.	Add new point:  <u>d. avoids reverse sensitivity effects between rural subdivision and lawfully established noise activities.</u>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P1: Compatible land use	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.62	Support	Supports P1 as it incorporates setbacks and layout design that avoids or mitigates the effects of reverse sensitivity on existing, lawfully established activities	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P7: Providing for connectivity	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.63	Support	Supports P7 as it manages location of subdivision to promote multi modal usage.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P8: Access and egress	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.64	Amend	Supports P8 as it manages access and egress however request that it includes safe and efficient operation of the state highway network	Amend:  <u>f) safe and efficient operation of the state highway network</u>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P12: Provision of infrastructure in rural areas	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.65	Amend	Supports in part P12 as it manages the design and location of subdivisions to avoid multiple accesses in close proximity on rural roads. Request that this be broadened to include the state highway network	Amend:  Manage the design and location of subdivision to avoid the close proximity of multiple access points on rural roads <u>and state highways.</u>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.66	Support	Supports the matters of control, which allow decision-makers to consider effects on the transport network.	<u>Retain matters of control for SUB-R1A</u>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.67	Amend	Supports amendment to the activity status where activity conditions are not meet section. Seek any subdivision accessing a state highway to fall within the restricted discretionary activity status to align the policy with TPT-R2, which sets a default activity status for any new or modified access and crossing onto a state highway.	Amend: Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: Non-compliance with SUB-S6 – SUB-S17 : Restricted Discretionary <u>Any subdivision with direct access to a state highway or arterial road : Restricted Discretionary</u>	Open Submission

# SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.68	Amend	Notes this rule as currently drafted allows for boundary adjustment activities without links to relevant access standards. considers that boundary adjustment activities have the potential to increase the intensity of residential activity or land use activities, which have the potential if not properly managed to adversely affect the transport network. Support amending the rule to include assessment of SUB-S12.	Amend:  Activity Status: Controlled Where: [...] <u>6. Compliance with standard SUB-S12.</u>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.69	Amend	Supports the controlled activity status for the subdivision of land for public works and network utilities but notes compliance with SUB-S6 – SUB-S18 must be achieved to meet this activity status. Request additional exemptions apply for SUB-S8 (building platforms) and SUB-S11 (shape factor), which appear to control effects for residential activities and amenity, to reflect the nature of subdivision for public works and network utilities.	Amend:  Activity Status: Controlled Where: Compliance with standards SUB-S6 - SUB-S7, SUB-S9 - SUB-S10 and SUB-S12 - SUB-S18 and Compliance with SUB-S1 - SUB-S5, <u>SUB-S8 and SUB-S11</u> (minimum lot sizes, <u>building platform and shape factor</u> ) does not apply.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.70	Support	Supports SUB-S12 and associated rules, which provide appropriate links between the subdivision and transport chapters, signalling to users of the DP appropriate transport and access standards applicable to any subdivision activity.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.71	Support	Supports SUB-S12 and associated rules, which provide appropriate links between the subdivision and transport chapters, signalling to users of the DP appropriate transport and access standards applicable to any subdivision activity.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.72	Support	Supports SUB-S12 and associated rules, which provide appropriate links between the subdivision and transport chapters, signalling to users of the DP appropriate transport and access standards applicable to any subdivision activity.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Kainga Ora - Brendon Liggett	285.20	Support	Supports the proposed subdivision provisions, to the extent that these enable for a controlled activity pathway, with no minimum lot size, for subdivisions that are associated with a land use consent (SUB-S1(1)).	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Kainga Ora - Brendon Liggett	285.21	Oppose	Opposes the proposed minimum lot size for vacant lot subdivision, being 350m <sup>2</sup> within SUB-S1(2).	Amend so that within the GRZ, the minimum vacant allotment size is 300m <sup>2</sup> ; that within the MRZ and HRZ, a minimum shape factor of 8m x 15m. This shape factor shall be located outside of: Land which may be subject to instability or is otherwise geotechnically unsuitable; Network Utilities, including private and public lines.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Kainga Ora - Brendon Liggett	285.25	Oppose	Opposes the proposed minimum lot size for vacant lot subdivision, being 350m <sup>2</sup> within SUB-S1(2).	Amend so that within the GRZ, the minimum vacant allotment size is 300m <sup>2</sup> ; that within the MRZ and HRZ, a minimum shape factor of 8m x 15m. This shape factor shall be located outside of: Land which may be subject to instability or is otherwise geotechnically unsuitable; Network Utilities, including private and public lines.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Son Nguyen	287.9	Amend	Consider amending standard to contain site specific information prior to design.	No specific relief has been sought.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O3: Infrastructure, transport, and connectivity	Alec Duncan	288.46	Support	Fire and Emergency supports SUB-O3 insofar as it requires a subdivision layout that is safe, efficient and resilient and integrates with existing communities and provides for the long-term needs of its residents. Fire and Emergency further supports that the infrastructure supporting subdivision and development is planned and provided for in an integrated and comprehensive manner at the time of subdivision.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O5: Natural hazards	Alec Duncan	288.47	Support	Fire and Emergency has additional functions under the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017 to respond to weather events, natural hazard events and disasters. Fire and Emergency's Risk Reduction Strategy 2019–2029 states that reducing risk is the single most effective mechanism to protect people, property and environment. As well as preventing incidents occurring in the first place, reducing the frequency of incidents, and mitigating the impacts of an emergency are also core risk reduction interventions. While Fire and Emergency's primary focus remains on the reduction of unwanted fire, Fire and Emergency as a primary responder during natural hazard events work across four areas of emergency management, through a model known as the 4Rs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>reduction of risk</li> <li>ensuring response readiness</li> <li>providing emergency response</li> <li>making coordinated efforts to facilitate recovery following an emergency.</li> </ul> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that as defined, natural hazards include fire. This objective achieves the purpose of the RMA by providing for the safety and wellbeing of people and communities and addresses the risk to property across the district.</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission



# SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P8: Access and egress	Alec Duncan	288.48	Amend	Fire and Emergency supports SUB-P8 insofar that it seeks to manage the number, location, and design of access and egress points. It is important that safe and efficient emergency service access is also provided, whether that be by vehicle or by foot to ensure Fire and Emergency personnel can effectively access a site and/or structure in an emergency and without compromising the egress of residents escaping the site or other emergency services such as St John and Police. This relief supports the subsequent relief sought below in relation to the design and location of access including the provision of pedestrian access where no vehicle access is to be provided.	<p><b>Amend as follows:</b>  <b>SUB-P8 Access and egress</b></p> <p>Manage the number, location, and design of access and egress points to support all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) safety and amenity for pedestrians and cyclists to and from the site and along the street frontage;</li> <li>b) visibility of vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists when exiting the site;</li> <li>c) efficient access to the site to minimise queuing within the integrated transportation network;</li> <li>d) safe and efficient operation of intersections, and</li> <li>e) encourage shared vehicle access by way of rear lanes in urban areas, where appropriate, to avoid the proliferation of vehicle crossings.</li> <li>f) <u>Safe and efficient emergency access and egress.</u></li> </ul>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P9: Integrated provision of infrastructure	Alec Duncan	288.49	Amend	Fire and Emergency supports SUB-P9 insofar that it requires subdivision to provide servicing that meets the requirements of the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure and that connects sites capable of containing a building, in areas where service connections to the public network are available and capacity exists. This includes the potable water networks unless it is demonstrated that an alternative means of servicing can be provided meeting legislative and acceptable environmental outcomes. Fire and Emergency notes that the water supply network does not just serve for potable use, and this should be clarified in the policy with reference to both potable and firefighting water supply.	<p><b>Amend as follows:</b>  <b>SUB-P9: Integrated provision of infrastructure</b></p> <p>Require subdivision to provide servicing that meets the requirements of the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure and that:</p> <p>...</p> <p>d) connects sites capable of containing a building, in areas where service connections to the public network are available and capacity exists, to the following networks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. wastewater;</li> <li>ii. stormwater, and</li> <li>iii. <u>potable water supply (for both potable and firefighting use).</u></li> </ul>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P12: Provision of infrastructure in rural areas	Alec Duncan	288.50	Amend	Fire and Emergency opposes SUB-P12 as it omits the need to require sites capable of containing a building, in areas where no reticulated water supply network is available, to be of a size and shape that provides for the storage on a firefighting water supply.  An amendment to the policy is sought.	<p>SUB-P12: Provision of infrastructure in rural areas</p> <p>a. Require sites capable of containing a building, in areas where no reticulated water supply, stormwater, or wastewater network is available, to be of a size and shape that provides for:</p> <p>...</p> <p>iii. the storage of potable water <u>and a firefighting water supply.</u></p> <p>...</p>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P15: Natural hazards	Alec Duncan	288.51	Support	Fire and Emergency supports SUB-P15 as it requires subdivisions to either avoid natural hazards or be designed to mitigate risks from natural hazards by improving accessibility for residents in an emergency event by minimising cul-de-sacs, terminating rights of way, and avoiding gated communities. As the primary emergency responder in natural hazard emergency, it is important that Fire and Emergency are able to reach people within properties, but it is just as important that people within properties have a safe and clear path from properties to an area that is clear from the natural hazard.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Alec Duncan	288.52	Support	Fire and Emergency supports the requirement for unserviced sites in the Settlement Zone to have a larger minimum allotment size to ensure that new allotments in unreticulated areas can accommodate an onsite firefighting water supply. Furthermore, Fire and Emergency support the non-complying activity status where SUB-S3 is not met.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Alec Duncan	288.53	Amend	Subject to the amendments sought in the Transport chapter for vehicle access (TPT-S4) Fire and Emergency supports SUB-S12 as it requires all new allotments to have vehicular access to an existing, legal road that complies with the relevant provisions of the Transport chapter for vehicle access and manoeuvrability.  Fire and Emergency requests a new specific matter of discretion be included for subdivision activities where a subdivision is not able to comply with the transport chapter, whereby consideration is given to the extent of consistency with the requirements of the Designers' guide to firefighting operations Emergency vehicle access F5-02 GD and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.	<p><b>Add a new matter of discretion as follows:</b></p> <p><b>Matters of discretion:</b></p> <p><u>5. The extent of consistency with the requirements of the Designers' guide to firefighting operations Emergency vehicle access F5-02 GD and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p>	Open Submission

# SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table	Alec Duncan	288.54	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency strongly supports SUB-514 insofar as it requires all new lots that require water to be connected to a public reticulated water supply where a supply is available. Where a new lot will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the subdivider must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply can be provided (including firefighting water supply).</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes there is no specified standard provided for determining a satisfactory firefighting water supply, however, acknowledges that the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure sets out the minimum standard for a reticulated firefighting water supply system which includes compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008. Fire and Emergency notes that this is however specific to the reticulated network and there appear to be no standards that set out how to provide a suitable and accessible alternative unreticulated firefighting water supply. This should be the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</p> <p>As such, Fire and Emergency requests an amendment to SUB-514 requiring alternative firefighting water supplies to be provided in accordance with SNZ 4509:2008. Furthermore, it is requested an additional matter of discretion relating to the extent of non-compliance where compliance with SNZ 4509:2008 cannot be achieved. This should be a matter that is carefully considered in relation to the health, safety and wellbeing of future occupiers of the subdivision and the ability or not for Fire and Emergency to respond in a fire emergency. This will ensure that where water supply servicing cannot be met under SUB-514, NCC will have suitable discretion as to the extent a new allotment is able to be provided with a suitable firefighting water supply.</p>	<p>Amend SUB-514 as follows:</p> <p>SUB-514: Water supply</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All new allotments created that require water must be connected to a public reticulated water supply where a supply is available.</li> <li>At the time of subdivision, sufficient land for water to be set aside.</li> <li>Where a new lot will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the subdivider must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply can be provided (including firefighting water supply <u>in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008</u>).</li> </ol> <p>Matters of discretion:</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>5. The extent of compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</u></p>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Assessment criteria /SUB-AC1: General, applies to all subdivision (including boundary adjustments)	Alec Duncan	288.55	Amend	<p>As subdivision is provided for as controlled and discretionary activities in the PDP, it is important that the assessment criteria that applies to all subdivision (as matters of control and matters of discretion) ensure that NCC can consider the operational requirements of Fire and Emergency, particularly firefighting water supply and access matters. This will provide NCC the opportunity to appropriately condition controlled activities to manage any adverse effects and condition or decline a restricted discretionary activity if non-compliance in relation to firefighting water supply and access are not adequately addressed. Fire and Emergency submit on the following matters:</p> <p>Safe, connected, and efficient transport network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Subject to the acceptance of all amendments sought to chapter TPT – Transport and to SUB-512, Fire and Emergency strongly supports SUB-AC1(b) which considers the extent to which the Transportation chapter standards for vehicle access and manoeuvring are able to be complied with, including TPT-S4 and TPT-S6.</li> </ul> <p>Stormwater and infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure requires the water supply network be designed in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008, Fire and Emergency supports SUB-AC1 (g) which considers compliance with the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure.</li> <li>Fire and Emergency requests SUB-AC1(i)(i), which relates to the ability for the site to effectively and efficiently meet firefighting requirements, directly references the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as a means to determine the extent to which the subdivision meet firefighting requirements.</li> </ul>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>SUB-AC1 General, applies to all subdivision (including boundary adjustments)</p> <p>Stormwater and infrastructure</p> <p>...</p> <p>i. When the site is not proposed to be connected to a public water supply:</p> <p>i. the ability for the site to effectively and efficiently meet firefighting requirements <u>in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008, and</u></p> <p>the ability to show how the site will be serviced by an acceptable alternative water supply.</p>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Issues /SUB-I2: The impacts of subdivision on natural resources (landscapes, water quality, biodiversity, and highly productive land)	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.107	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Objectives /SUB-O2: Impact of the built environment on landscapes, biodiversity, water quality, and other key environmental matters	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.108	Support	Strongly supports the objective of ensuring that subdivision protects, maintains and enhances natural environmental values.	Retain	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P1: Compatible land use	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.109	Amend	Considers this policy, which refers in general terms to supporting the objectives, policies and rules of the District Plan, should also refer to the need to protect, maintain and enhance natural environmental values, and to climate change resilience.	<p>Seeks to Add:</p> <p><u>f. enables natural environmental values to be protected, maintained and enhanced.</u></p> <p><u>g. reflects the need to ensure that new development will be resilient to climate change, including locating new subdivisions away from flood plains.</u></p>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P2: Quality living environments	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.110	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission

# SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P3: Subdivision design integrates with the environment	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.111	Amend	Considers the policy should ensure integration with ecological corridors and also refer to indigenous biodiversity.  The important concepts of low impact design and green infrastructure should be used consistently throughout the plan.  Additions are needed to provide guidance towards green infrastructure and low impact design and planting (it is not clear what indigenous landscaping is).	Amend as follows:  a. protects, maintains, and enhances natural ecosystems, <u>ecological corridors</u> , waterbodies, and indigenous vegetation <u>and biodiversity</u> , including the retention of mature trees and vegetation <del>where possible</del> ; b. incorporates sufficient space for onsite stormwater attenuation and disposal including the use of water-sensitive <u>and low-impact</u> design solutions <u>and green infrastructure</u> , constructed in a way that mitigates the adverse effects of the quantity and quality of stormwater being discharged from sites; ... d. includes indigenous landscaping <u>and planting</u> to enhance biodiversity, reduce rate of stormwater run-off, assist with the removal of contaminants, and to soften the built form.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P5: Open space and reserves.	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.112	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P6: Protection and maintenance of landscapes in identified landscape overlay areas.	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.113	Amend	Considers the policy needs to be broader than 'visually prominent locations', and is too low a bar for the coastal environment.	Amend as follows:  Within outstanding natural features and special character features and landscapes, land is subdivided in a way that avoids the need to place buildings, earthworks, and features in visually prominent and <u>ecologically sensitive</u> locations, <u>recognising that in the coastal environment, buildings may not be appropriate at all.</u>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P7: Providing for connectivity.	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.114	Support	Supports direction to provide for walking and cycleways.	Retain.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P12: Provision of infrastructure in rural areas	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.115	Amend	Considers the requirement for rural subdivision to provide for self- contained servicing should also refer to low-impact design and green infrastructure.	Seeks to add the following:  a. iv. The use of low-impact design solutions and green infrastructure where possible.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P15: Natural hazards.	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.116	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P16: Protecting significant natural areas.	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.117	Amend	The provisions relating to Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity have not been included in the Proposed District Plan and will be released at a later date as a variation.	Seeks to ensure that the provisions (objectives, policies and rules) of the ECO chapter manage subdivision in or near SNAs in order to protect those areas.  Alternatively, include policies and rules to that effect in the SUB chapter.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P17: Conservation sites.	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.118	Oppose	Considers 'Conservation sites' are not defined in the plan. Assumes that such areas would be protected from development and not be allowed to be built on.  Assumes this would not extend to areas of indigenous biodiversity. Subdivision of areas of biodiversity can result in loss or fragmentation.	Seeks to include a definition of conservation sites in the plan, that clarifies that these sites are to be protected from development.  Clarify that this policy does not apply to areas of indigenous biodiversity. The plan should not provide for subdivision of important biodiversity areas.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /General /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.119	Oppose	Opposes whole chapter, including Introduction, Objectives, Policies and Rules. Arising from late notification of ECO-chapter.	Seeks to add: "The <b>Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity</b> chapter includes provisions which relate to subdivision. Where there is a conflict between the Subdivision chapter and the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter, the provisions that place greater or additional restrictions on activities with adverse effects on the natural environment will apply".	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.120	Amend	Considers the rules do not appear to deal with subdivision in the coastal environment. The CE chapter objectives and policies must be given effect to in the SUB rules.	Seeks to include a new rule making subdivision in the coastal environment restricted discretionary.  Ensure that the matters of discretion include effects on coastal values.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.121	Oppose	Considers the matters of control should include natural environmental values relating to indigenous ecosystems and biodiversity.	Seeks to Add:  <u>10. Indigenous ecosystems and biodiversity, including the protection of SNAs;</u>  And re number subsequent points	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.122	Oppose	Considers the matters of control should include natural environmental values relating to ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity.	Seeks to Add:  <u>6. Indigenous ecosystems and biodiversity, including the protection of significant natural areas;</u>  And renumber subsequent points	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.123	Amend	Seeks a rule making subdivision of land within or containing an SNA non-complying.  Clarify whether conservation lots can be created.	Ensure that subdivision of land within or containing an SNA is non-complying.	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.124	Amend	Considers the matters of discretion need to include coastal values.  They should also refer to habitats for indigenous fauna, as these are not limited to indigenous vegetation and trees.	Include coastal values and habitat for indigenous fauna in matters of discretion.	Open Submission

## SUB - Subdivision

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.125	Oppose	Considers the matters of discretion relating to natural environmental values should be clarified and expanded.	Amend as follows:  8. Protection, maintenance, and/or enhancement of <u>natural environmental values including natural features, indigenous trees and vegetation, indigenous habitats and biodiversity, and significant natural areas;</u>	Open Submission
SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.126	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission

# ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water /ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water - Rules Table /ASW-R4: The use of motorised craft in Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (Ahuriri Estuary)	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.93	Oppose	This rule applies to water that is within the coastal marine area and therefore outside of Napier City Council's jurisdiction. Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (Ahuriri estuary) water is located below mean high water springs. Activities in the coastal marine area are managed under the Regional Coastal Plan. This rule should therefore be deleted.	Delete Rule ASW-R4	Open Submission
ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water /Introduction /	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.94	Amend	The introduction includes reference to the Council managing land use and activities on the surface of water in Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (Ahuriri estuary) above the coastal marine area boundary. All of the estuary is located within the coastal marine area and is therefore outside of the jurisdiction of Napier City Council and the District Plan. References to the estuary in this introduction should therefore be removed.	Amend the introduction of this chapter to remove references to Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (Ahuriri estuary).	Open Submission
ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water /ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water - Rules Table /General	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.56	Amend	The submitter considers that ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water - Rules Table should be amended as Ravensdown and no doubt a range of other resource users in the broader region, have a range of research and environmental monitoring obligations, generally associated with regional resource consent requirements. In addition, universities also undertake research. Given the PDP's ASW proposed Rule framework, these parties would need to seek a non-complying resource consent, in accordance with Rule ASW-R8, to meet these obligations. These parties would also be prohibited from carrying out scientific research in Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (Ahuriri Estuary) (Rule ASW-R4B). It is considered this rule framework is too restrictive and that a permitted activity rule, given the nature of effects associated with these activities, should be included in the PDP to provide for these activities throughout the city.	Amend the ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water - Rules Table by inserting the following rule:  <u>ASW-RX: Non-motorised and motorised environmental monitoring and scientific research activities</u>  <u>Activity status: Permitted</u>  <u>Where:</u>  <u>Any water craft used on Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (Ahuriri Estuary), must not be powered by a motor exceeding ten horsepower.</u>	Open Submission
ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water /ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water - Rules Table /ASW-R4: The use of motorised craft in Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (Ahuriri Estuary)	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.57	Amend	The submitter considers that Rule ASW-R4: The use of motorised craft in Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (Ahuriri Estuary) should be amended as Rule ASW-R4A permits the use of motorised craft in Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (Ahuriri Estuary) for a range of activities, including environmental monitoring and scientific research provided it is carried out by or for the listed organisations. Where the conditions of this rule cannot be complied, the use of motorised craft on the estuary becomes a prohibited activity (Rule ASW-R4B). For the reasons discussed, it is considered that the new permitted activity rule requested above, more appropriately provides for the monitoring and research needs within the city as a whole. For this reason, changes to Rule ASW-R4A are required (i.e., so the new rule applies to these activities and not Rule ASW-R4A).	Amend Rule ASW-R4 as follows:  ASW-R4A  Activity Status: Permitted  Where:  1. The use of motorised craft may be for one or more of the following purposes: a. emergency purposes. b. water safety training purposes. <del>c. environmental monitoring;</del> <del>d. scientific research, undertaken by or on behalf of:</del> <del>i. Department of Conservation;</del> <del>ii. the HBRC;</del> <del>iii. a territorial authority;</del> <del>iv. a district health board, or</del> <del>v. NIWA or other Crown Research Institute.</del>	Open Submission
ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water /Objectives /ASW-O1: Balancing activities on the surface of water	Trevor Ellis	253.52	Amend	considers that the objective as read prioritises recreational, commercial, and cultural activities over the health of the waterbodies. Freshwater bodies are managed under the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and thus should be managed in Te Mana o te Wai framework which prioritises the health and wellbeing of the waterbody. Inserting the words "avoiding, mitigating or remedying adverse" in front of "effects on the environment" will ensure that the NPS-FM is implemented to prioritise the health and wellbeing of waterbodies.	seeks to amend the wording as follows: ASW-O1: Balancing activities on the surface of water The surface of waterbodies is utilised for a wide range of recreational, commercial, and cultural activities and for water protection activities, while providing for the safe and efficient management of people and <b>avoiding, mitigating or remedying adverse</b> effects on the environment.	Open Submission
ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water /Objectives /ASW-O2: Natural character, recreational, and intrinsic values	Trevor Ellis	253.53	Support	ASW-O2 gives effect to the Act	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water /Policies /ASW-P1: Managing conflicts between people, and the environment	Trevor Ellis	253.54	Support	ASW-P1 gives effect to the NPS-FM and NPS-IB. Being able to restrict activities depending on the state of the environment is beneficial to restore the environment where it has been degraded or is undergoing treatment.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

# ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water /Policies /ASW-P2: Use of motorised water craft on rivers	Trevor Ellis	253.55	Support	ASW-P2 gives effect to the NPS-FM and NPS-IB. Restricting access to rivers and waterbodies is vital to maintaining, restoring, and enhancing riparian margins.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water /Policies /ASW-P3: Conflict between activities	Trevor Ellis	253.56	Support	Reducing the risk of conflict between activities is important to maintain healthy waterbodies. ASW-P3 combined with the other policies allows for safe use of freshwater bodies with the protection of the environment.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water /Policies /ASW-P4: Effects of recreational, commercial, and cultural activities	Trevor Ellis	253.57	Support	ASW-P4 gives effect to the Act and the NPS-FM.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water /ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water - Rules Table /ASW-R2: Pest control and control of noxious flora and fauna	Trevor Ellis	253.58	Amend	considers that pest control being permitted without conditions may have adverse effects on the water bodies, surrounding indigenous biodiversity (see herbicides) and receiving environments. It may have additional adverse effects on human health when used in areas that frequently have recreational activities ongoing.	seeks to amend wording as follows:  ASW-R2: Pest control and control of noxious flora and fauna  Activity Status: Permitted  <u>Note: The discharge of chemicals to water is an activity that may require a resource consent from the Hawkes Bay Regional Council.</u>	Open Submission
ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water /ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water - Rules Table /ASW-R3: The use of motorised craft by a local authority or organisation exercising powers, functions and duties required as part of their responsibilities under any relevant statutory provisions	Trevor Ellis	253.59	Amend	considers that except in emergency situations, there should be a requirement that they are limited to launching and returning in designated sites to not disrupt or destroy flora and fauna. Support the activity status of prohibited where ASW-R4A is not met.	seeks to amend ASW-R3 and ASW-R4 to include a requirement that, except in emergency situations, launching and returning to land should be done in designated launching sites to prevent harm to flora and fauna.	Open Submission
ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water /ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water - Rules Table /ASW-R4: The use of motorised craft in Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (Ahuriri Estuary)	Trevor Ellis	253.60	Amend	considers that except in emergency situations, there should be a requirement that they are limited to launching and returning in designated sites to not disrupt or destroy flora and fauna. Support the activity status of prohibited where ASW-R4A is not met.	seeks to amend ASW-R3 and ASW-R4 to include a requirement that, except in emergency situations, launching and returning to land should be done in designated launching sites to prevent harm to flora and fauna.	Open Submission
ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water /General /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.127	Amend	As set out in the s32 report, most significant indigenous biodiversity is in and around Te Whanganui-a-Orotū, the current low levels of indigenous habitat are at risk of accelerated decline and local extinctions.	Ensure that provisions in the ASW provide strong protection for Te Whanganui-a-Orotū.	Open Submission
ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water /Issues /ASW-I2: Activities on the surface of water can have detrimental effects on the quality of the water resource and its flora and fauna	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.128	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission
ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water /Issues /ASW-I4: Vehicle access to water and use of motorised craft can have detrimental effects on plant and animal life through noise disturbance, wave lap, and/or physical contact, particularly at certain periods of the year when water levels are low	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.129	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission
ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water /Objectives /ASW-O2: Natural character, recreational, and intrinsic values	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.130	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission
ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water /Policies /ASW-P4: Effects of recreational, commercial, and cultural activities	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.131	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission
ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water /ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water - Rules Table /ASW-R3: The use of motorised craft by a local authority or organisation exercising powers, functions and duties required as part of their responsibilities under any relevant statutory provisions	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.132	Oppose	Considers this rule is too broad, and does not give effect to the policy direction to ensure that effects on the environment are managed.	Seeks to Make controlled.  Delete the reference to 'other organisation'. The Department of Conservation could be inserted instead.	Open Submission

## ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water /ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water - Rules Table /ASW-R4: The use of motorised craft in Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (Ahuriri Estuary)	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.133	Support	Considers military training activities should not be provided for at this important ecological site.	Amend as follows: <del>e. temporary military training activities</del>	Open Submission
ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water /ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water - Rules Table /ASW-R6: Non-commercial motorised water recreation activities on Waiohinanga/Esk River	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.134	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission
ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water /ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water - Rules Table /ASW-R7: Commercial motorised water recreation activities	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.135	Support	No Submission Made	Retain	Open Submission
ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water /ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water - Rules Table /ASW-R8: Activities not otherwise provided for	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.136	Support	No Submission Made	Retain	Open Submission
ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water /ASW - Activities on the Surface of Water - Rules Table /ASW-R9: Temporary events when low flow water take restrictions on the river is in place	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.137	Support	No Submission Made	Retain	Open Submission

# CE - Coastal Environment

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
CE - Coastal Environment /Introduction /The use, development and protection of the coastal environment must be managed in accordance with the RMA and requirements of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 (NZCPS).	Rebecca Eng	99.75	Support	Supports the mapping and identification of the Coastal Environment. There are no existing National Grid assets within the Coastal Environment as identified in the PDP.	Retain the mapping of the Coastal Environment.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Objectives /CE-O1: Avoid adverse effects on natural character.  Relates to CE-I1, CE-I2, CE-I3 CE-I4, CE-I6, CE-I8, and CE-I9	Rebecca Eng	99.76	Support	Supports the reference to significant adverse effects and reference to 'inappropriate' subdivision, use and development.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P2: Determine whether an activity is inappropriate in the coastal environment. Relates to CE-O1, CE-O2, CE-O3, CE-O4, and CE-O5	Rebecca Eng	99.77	Support	Supports the reference to 'functional or operational need'.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /CE - Coastal Environment - Rules Table.	Rebecca Eng	99.78	Support	Supports the note (and therefore the clarification) there are no specific Coastal Environment Chapter rules, and instead reliance on other PDP rules.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Introduction /The management of this coastline is a collaboration between Napier City Council and Hawke's Bay Regional Council. Napier City Council manages activities landward of the mean high-water spring while the Hawke's Bay Regional Council is responsible for activities seaward of the mean high-water spring.	Rebecca Eng	99.79	Amend	Transpower requests clarification on the relationship between the various district plan chapters. On the basis of the introductory text to the Network Utility Chapter ("To achieve this, the network utility provisions in the District Plan provide for the establishment, ... . As many network utilities are lineal and traverse many parts of the district, it is considered appropriate that a single set of rules be provided that apply across the District.") it is assumed the intent is the Coastal Environment Chapter would not apply to Network Utilities. Transpower requests amended text to clarify the relationship between the plan chapters.  Should this not be the intent, appropriate policy recognition is required for Network Utilities within the Coastal Environment Chapter	Amend the text as follows:  This chapter contains the overarching objectives and policy framework to protect and manage the natural character and values of the coastal environment as well as provisions to manage activities within it. However, the associated rules are contained in the underlying zone chapters, such as the Open Space Zone, the Rural Production Zone, Subdivision, and other relevant district-wide chapters of the District Plan. <u>The policy and rule framework for the operation, maintenance, upgrade and development of Network Utilities are managed in the Network Utilities Chapter.</u>	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Objectives /General	Sheena McGuire	168.77	Amend	Notes that the Coastal Environmental Overlay extends over large sections of the rail corridor within Napier City. Acknowledges mapping of the corridor parallel to the coast but requests provisions that accommodate rail activities within the established corridor, recognizing the functional necessity for such activities to be situated there. Considers that a new policy is required to reflect how the rail corridor interacts with the coastal environment and provide for rail activities.	Amend as follows:  <u>CE-O7: Adverse effects of network utilities</u>  <u>The adverse effects of network utilities on the natural character of the coastal environment are avoided, remedied, or mitigated, as far as is practicable, while recognising the functional and operational needs of network utilities (including those associated with their scale, design, and locational requirements).</u>	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P2: Determine whether an activity is inappropriate in the coastal environment.  Relates to CE-O1, CE-O2, CE-O3, CE-O4, and CE-O5	Sheena McGuire	168.78	Support	Supports this policy which guides decision makers on whether an activity is appropriate in the coastal environment. Supports consideration of the functional or operational need to locate within the coastal environment, opportunity to mitigate anticipated effects, and the existing land uses on the site. Considers these matters are especially helpful for linear infrastructure such as the rail corridor which cannot be easily relocated.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /General /General	Mark Leggett	180.6	Oppose	Opposes the entire Chapter. Notes references in CE Chapter policies to the importance and modified nature of the Port, the functional/operational need for a location in the coastal environment, and the impact of existing land uses on natural character in policies and accounting for existing built character in assessment criteria. However considers that these are not reflected in the CE Chapter objectives, and broadly the CE Chapter provisions are strongly oriented towards the preservation and protection of natural character, natural features, coastal values, and indigenous biodiversity. Considers that current CE Chapter provisions do not appropriately give effect to the NZCPS and particularly Policy 9. Greater recognition needs to be given to the highly modified nature of the Port and environs in the CE Chapter objectives. Requests that the CE Chapter objectives are amended to clear that proposals in this location are not to be held to the same values assessment as those in less modified coastal locations. Notes that A cross-reference in the CE Chapter to the provisions of the Port Zone should also be made.	Amend CE Chapter objectives as required to acknowledge the importance and modified nature of the Port, functional/operational need for a location in the coastal environment, and the impact of existing land uses on natural character.  Amend the CE Chapter (under the heading 'Other relevant District Plan provisions') to include a cross- reference to the Part 3 PORTZ – Port Zone Chapter provisions.	Open Submission



# CE - Coastal Environment

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
CE - Coastal Environment /Objectives /General	Mark Leggett	180.25	Oppose	Opposes the entire Chapter. Notes references in CE Chapter policies to the importance and modified nature of the Port, the functional/operational need for a location in the coastal environment, and the impact of existing land uses on natural character in policies and accounting for existing built character in assessment criteria. However considers that these are not reflected in the CE Chapter objectives, and broadly the CE Chapter provisions are strongly oriented towards the preservation and protection of natural character, natural features, coastal values, and indigenous biodiversity. Considers that current CE Chapter provisions do not appropriately give effect to the NZCPS and particularly Policy 9. Greater recognition needs to be given to the highly modified nature of the Port and environs in the CE Chapter objectives. Requests that the CE Chapter objectives are amended to clear that proposals in this location are not to be held to the same values assessment as those in less modified coastal locations. Notes that A cross-reference in the CE Chapter to the provisions of the Port Zone should also be made.	Amend CE Chapter objectives as required to acknowledge the importance and modified nature of the Port, functional/operational need for a location in the coastal environment, and the impact of existing land uses on natural character.  Amend the CE Chapter (under the heading 'Other relevant District Plan provisions') to include a cross- reference to the Part 3 PORTZ – Port Zone Chapter provisions.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /General /General	Ellen Robotham	198.45	Support	Generally supportive of the Coastal Environment chapter.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Issues /CE-I1: The values associated with the natural character of the coastal environment are identified and protected from significant adverse effects.	Grant Russell	202.14	Support	Supports CE-I1: The values associated with the natural character of the coastal environment are identified and protected from significant adverse effects and reference to the "highly modified port".	Retain CE-I1: The values associated with the natural character of the coastal environment are identified and protected from significant adverse effects in its entirety.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Issues /General	Grant Russell	202.15	Support	Supports Policy 13 of the NZCPS 2010 mention in CE - Coastal Environment - Issues extending to specific mention of Ports.	Amend CE - Coastal Environment - Issues to specifically mention Ports under Policy 13 of the NZCPS 2010.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Objectives /General	Grant Russell	202.16	Amend	Considers Policy 13 of the NZCPS 2010 mention of Ports should be included as an Objective in CE - Coastal Environment.	Amend CE - Coastal Environment - Objectives to specifically mention Ports under Policy 13 of the NZCPS 2010.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P1: Identify and protect the natural features and natural character of the coastal environment.  Relates to CE-O1, CE-O4, and CE-O5	Grant Russell	202.17	Amend	Supports Policy CE-P1: Identify and protect the natural features and natural character of the coastal environment acknowledgement of the Port as "important infrastructure" and "highly modified" with a proposed "significant" wording amendment.	Amend Policy CE-P1: Identify and protect the natural features and natural character of the coastal environment as follows:  <del>important</del> <u>significant</u> infrastructure, such as the port, the wastewater and stormwater infrastructure, and the National Aquarium amongst others;	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /CE - Coastal Environment - Rules Table /General	Grant Russell	202.18	Support	Supports CE - Coastal Environment - Rules Table with cross referencing amendment.	Amend CE - Coastal Environment - Rules Table to ensure appropriate cross references are in the underlying zone chapters so that the coastal environment Objectives (CE-O1 to CE-O6), Policies (CE-P1 to CE-P12) and Assessment Criteria (CE-AC-1) are assessed in any resource consent application.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Issues /CE-I1: The values associated with the natural character of the coastal environment are identified and protected from significant adverse effects.	Georgina McPherson	215.94	Support	The Fuel Companies support the recognition of important infrastructure such as the port and a highly modified port being part of the character of Napier's coastal environment.	Retain CE-I1 as notified.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P1: Identify and protect the natural features and natural character of the coastal environment.  Relates to CE-O1, CE-O4, and CE-O5	Georgina McPherson	215.95	Support	CE-P1 is supported to the extent it recognises that the character of the coastal environment in Napier includes important infrastructure, such as the port, the wastewater and stormwater infrastructure, and the National Aquarium amongst others.	Retain CE-P1 as notified.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P2: Determine whether an activity is inappropriate in the coastal environment.  Relates to CE-O1, CE-O2, CE-O3, CE-O4, and CE-O5	Georgina McPherson	215.96	Support	The Fuel Companies support that particular regard must be given to both the functional and operational need of activities to locate within the coastal environment and the existing land uses on the site.	Retain CE-P2 as notified.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P10: Avoid activities in coastal and riparian margin. Relates to CE-O1, CE-O4, and CE-O5	Georgina McPherson	215.97	Support	The policy can be supported provided the reference to no 'undue risk' of contamination of water is retained. The Fuel Companies' wharfline and bunkerlines have a functional need to locate within coastal margins.	Retain CE-P10 as notified.	Open Submission

# CE - Coastal Environment

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
CE - Coastal Environment /CE - Coastal Environment /General	Trevor Ellis	253.61	Amend	Considers that the Coastal Environment chapter has not been updated sufficiently to give effect to the NZCPS 2010. The language used in the chapter reflects the language of the Hawke's Bay Regional Coastal Plan, which was notified in 2008, meaning the Regional Coastal Plan uses the terminology of the NZCPS 1994. Terminology should be updated to reflect the current NZCPS 2010. The section 32 report only mentions policy 13 of the NZCPS 2010. There's no further exploration of how the chapter gives effect to the other 28 policies, and in particular avoidance policies like 11, 15, 16, 23, and 25. The entire chapter should be reviewed in light of the current NZCPS 2010 to ensure that more than policy 13 is implemented and update the language to the current NZCPS.	Seeks that the Coastal Environment chapter be amended to ensure that the chapter gives effect to the entirety of the NZCPS 2010 and not only policy 13.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Introduction /General	Trevor Ellis	253.62	Amend	It is understood that the chapter is written to give effect to the HBRCP which was notified before the NZCPS 2010 was gazetted and thus gives effect to the previous NZCPS 1994. While the NZCPS 2010 does include policies that require Councils to preserve natural character of the environment, the term natural character is more narrowly defined in the latest iteration of the NZCPS. To fully give effect to the NZCPS 2010 as a higher order document, the language must be updated to acknowledge more than the natural character of the environment is to be protected. However, the language should be updated to reflect the NZCPS 2010 due to its status as a higher order document.	Amend the introduction to use the NZCPS 2010 terminology and language, for example: The use, development and protection of the coastal environment must be managed in accordance with the RMA and requirements of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 (NZCPS). They include requirements for preserving, <u>restoring, and enhancing</u> the natural character of the coastal environment and protecting it from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development. <u>It further provides requirements to avoid adverse and significant adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity.</u> The Plan identifies the extent of the coastal environment mapped as the Coastal Environment overlay recognising the characteristics and features where coastal processes, influences and qualities are significant.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Objectives /CE-O1: Avoid adverse effects on natural character.  Relates to CE-11, CE-12, CE-13 CE-14, CE-16, CE-18, and CE-19	Trevor Ellis	253.63	Amend	Considers that CE-O1 tries to give effect to policies 11, 13, 15 but fails to properly reflect the requirements. For example: adverse effects on outstanding natural character, outstanding natural feature and indigenous biodiversity needs to be avoided but this objective only addresses significant adverse effects.	Seeks to amend the objective to properly implement policies 11, 13, and 15. Or Split the objective into three objectives and/or policies to individually cover policies 11, 13, and 15.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Objectives /CE-O2: Retain public access.  Relates to CE-14, CE-15, CE-16, and CE-17	Trevor Ellis	253.64	Amend	Considers that CE-O2 provides for public access which is in accordance with policy 19 of the NZCPS 2010. Open spaces in the coastal environment should be protected for additional interests of indigenous biodiversity since open space can be necessary breeding, roosting, and foraging sites for indigenous and migratory species. Public access can be retained and improved whilst restoration and protection of indigenous biodiversity is undertaken and improve the amenity value of the sites.	Seeks to amend CE-O2 as follows:  CE-O2: Retain public access A high level of public access continues to be provided on public land to and along coastal and estuarine areas and waterbodies, unless there is an ecological protection, conservation, security, or public health and safety reasons for restricting that access. The existing areas of undeveloped open space are protected for public recreation and education, <u>protection and restoration of indigenous and migratory biodiversity</u> , access to the water for water-related activities, and water-related recreational clubs.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Objectives /CE-O3: Values and functions of the coastal.  Relates to CE-11 to CE-19	Trevor Ellis	253.65	Amend	considers that CE-O3 provides a strong list of activities that protect and restore the values and functions of the coastal environment. To ensure that the Objective gives effect to the extent it is intending to, minor amendments are recommended. There are indigenous species that are located in the coastal environment without being migratory. Inserting indigenous in the third bullet point will help provide clarity that both types of species are looked after. Similarly, inserting coastal into the two stated types of ecosystems improves clarity that all types of ecosystem values that can be found in the coastal environment are protected and restored.	seeks to amend CE-O3 as follows: CE-O3: Values and functions of the coastal environment Provide for activities and development in the coastal environment that protect and/or restore the following values and functions:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• views along the foreshore and to and from the ocean;</li> <li>• recreational activities and educational values;</li> <li>• habitats of <u>indigenous and</u> migratory species;</li> <li>• safeguarding riparian, <u>coastal</u> and marine ecosystems;</li> <li>• preserving the natural character and amenity values of the coast and its margins;</li> <li>• providing for flood management and stormwater management;</li> <li>• historic heritage and cultural values;</li> <li>• public access;</li> <li>• customary practices including fishing and the gathering of mahinga kai, and</li> <li>• maintaining the beach, foreshore, and riparian margins.</li> </ul>	Open Submission

# CE - Coastal Environment

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
CE - Coastal Environment /Objectives /CE-O4: Natural character and mauri.  Relates to CE-I2, CE-I3, CE-I4, CE-I7, and CE-I9	Trevor Ellis	253.66	Support	CE-O4 gives effect to the NZCPS 2010.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Objectives /CE-O6: Integrated management approach.	Trevor Ellis	253.67	Amend	CE-O6 recognises the importance of integrated management between multiple organisations to improve the coastal environment. Amend the title to be O6 instead of 06.	Amend the title for CE-O6 as follows:  CE-006: Integrated management approach	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P1: Identify and protect the natural features and natural character of the coastal environment.  Relates to CE-O1, CE-O4, and CE-O5	Trevor Ellis	253.68	Oppose	Considers that CE-P1 is not a policy. A policy provides direction on how the objectives are to be achieved in a chapter. CE-P1 is a statement of what the Hawke's Bay Regional Council defines as the coastal environment and does not direct how the CE objectives are to be achieved. This statement is better suited as part of the introduction.  The wording recommended takes the spirit of the proposed policy and alters it to be worded as a policy.	Delete CE-P1 in its current form. Implement the statement of what the coastal environment is (as set out in policy 1 of the NZCPS) in the introduction and insert the following recommended wording:  <u>Identify and protect the natural features, natural landscapes, natural character and indigenous biodiversity of the Coastal Environment.</u>	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P2: Determine whether an activity is inappropriate in the coastal environment.  Relates to CE-O1, CE-O2, CE-O3, CE-O4, and CE-O5	Trevor Ellis	253.69	Amend	Considers that CE-P2 gives effect to the NZCPS 2010 in part. As stated in earlier submission points, the terminology of the Coastal Environment chapter is akin to the NZCPS 1994 where natural character was the umbrella term. Adding additional criteria such as indigenous biodiversity, coastal hazards, natural features and landscapes that are explicitly stated in the NZCPS 2010 will provide.	Seeks to amend CE-P2 by giving regard to coastal hazards and natural features and landscapes and specifically the following on indigenous biodiversity: CE-P2: Determine whether an activity is inappropriate in the coastal environment (...)  b. the degree to which the natural character, <u>existing indigenous biodiversity, coastal hazards, natural features and landscapes</u> will be modified, damaged, or destroyed including, but not limited, to:  i. the duration and frequency of any effect; ii. the magnitude or scale of any effect; iii. the irreversibility of adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity values, and/or iv. whether the activity will lead to cumulative adverse effects on the indigenous biodiversity of the site/area	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P3: Minimise disturbance of natural features and coastal values.  Relates to CE-O1 and CE-O4	Trevor Ellis	253.70	Amend	Considers that coastal species should be expanded to include migratory species and the word "significant" should be removed to give effect to the NZCPS 2010.	Seeks to amend CE-P3 as follows: CE-P3: Minimise disturbance of natural features and coastal values The character of the coastal environment is retained by ensuring there is minimal disturbance to the natural contours, coastal vegetation, habitats of indigenous and migratory coastal species, and any <del>significant</del> heritage, cultural, and ecological features.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P4: Control activities to prevent the incremental loss of biodiversity and natural values.  Relates to CE-O1, CE-O3 and CE-O4	Trevor Ellis	253.71	Amend	Considers that the policy name does not match what the policy itself is supposed to accomplish.	Seeks to amend CE-P4's name to match the intention of the policy.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P5: Improve the natural character of the coastal environment. Relates to CE-O1, CE-O2, CE-O3, CE-O4, and CE-O5	Trevor Ellis	253.72	Amend	Considers that CE-P5 does not implement NZCPS policy 14. Policy 14 promotes the restoration and rehabilitation of the natural character of the coastal environment regardless of degradation status, and instead provides for approaches on how to restore degraded areas. It is additionally not directive to how it will implement the objectives.	Seeks to amend CE-P5 as follows:  CE-P5: Improve the natural character of the coastal environment Policy 14 of the NZCPS promotes the restoration or rehabilitation of the natural character of the coastal environment <del>where it has been degraded</del> . The use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in the coastal environment is compatible with:  a. providing, maintaining, and improving ecological corridors; b. public access, open space, recreation, and amenity values; c. maintenance, <u>restoration, and enhancement</u> of indigenous biodiversity; d. bank stability and areas for the treatment of stormwater; e. reinstatement of natural hydrological systems, and f. retaining and restoring natural coastal features, ecosystems, and habitats.	Open Submission

# CE - Coastal Environment

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P7: Restrict activities within and close to sensitive coastal areas.  Relates to CE-O4	Trevor Ellis	253.73	Support	Supports as CE-P7 implements the NZCPS.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P8: Retain and reinstate natural values in the coastal environment.  Relates to CE-O1 and CE-O6	Trevor Ellis	253.74	Support	Supports as CE-P8 implements the NZCPS.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P9: Maintain natural buffer areas and setbacks around significant indigenous biodiversity.  Relates to CE-O1 and CE-O4	Trevor Ellis	253.75	Support	Supports as CE-P9 implements the NZCPS.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P10: Avoid activities in coastal and riparian margins. Relates to CE-O1, CE-O4, and CE-O5	Trevor Ellis	253.76	Support	Supports as CE-P10 implements the NZCPS.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P11: Manage pedestrian access to the coast and riparian margins. Relates to CE-O1, CE-O2, and CE-O3	Trevor Ellis	253.77	Support	Supports as CE-P11 implements the NZCPS.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P12: Restrict vehicle access.  Relates to CE-O1, CE-O2, CE-O4, and CE-O5	Trevor Ellis	253.78	Support	Supports as CE-P12 implements the NZCPS.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Assessment criteria /CE-AC1: All activities in the coastal environment.	Trevor Ellis	253.79	Amend	Considers that there is significant overlap between the assessment criteria listed. The assessment criteria should be refined and cut down by way of amendment to prevent confusion.  The assessment criteria for indigenous biodiversity should be expanded to include the potential adverse effects for indigenous biodiversity. Currently it only covers beneficial activities and not both beneficial and negative activities.	Seeks to amend CE-AC1 to refine the assessment criteria to prevent confusion and clarify. Insert under 'effects on indigenous biodiversity' whether the proposal prevents or contributes to the adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity such as, but not limited to, destruction of habitat.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Introduction /General	Alan Petersen	271.1	Amend	Second paragraph – Typo “plan/s” Remove slash.	Seeks that typo in second paragraph be corrected: "plan/s" - remove slash.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Issues /CE-I6: Effects of climate change on the coastal environment.	Alan Petersen	271.2	Amend	Considers that it should be included that: the coastal environment along Napier’s coastline (and nearby land & the seabed) was uplifted by 1.6m to 2m by the 1931 Earthquake.  This means the uplifted gravel barrier from Westshore to the north end of Bay View is safe from erosion for at least 100 years provided nourishment at Westshore is continued.	Amend CE-I6 by inserting the following:  The coastal environment along Napier’s coastline (and nearby land & the seabed) was uplifted by 1.6m to 2m by the 1931 Earthquake.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P1: Identify and protect the natural features and natural character of the coastal environment. Relates to CE-O1, CE-O4, and CE-O5	Alan Petersen	271.3	Amend	Considers that CE – P1 Bullet point - “An exposed gravel foreshore with a shingle beach” should be amended to reflect the definition of the Napier coastline, the technical term used by a geomorphologist (Jim Dahm), as a “raised gravel barrier”.	Amend CE-P1 character of the coastal environment in Napier as follows:  <del>An exposed gravel foreshore</del> <u>raised gravel barrier</u> with a shingle beach;  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Issues /CE-I1: The values associated with the natural character of the coastal environment are identified and protected from significant adverse effects.	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.155	Support	HNZPT supports CE-I1: The values associated with the natural character of the coastal environment are identified and protected from significant adverse effects as there is recognition of cultural and historic values in the coastal environment, along with other significant characteristics.	Retain CE-I1: The values associated with the natural character of the coastal environment are identified and protected from significant adverse effects as notified.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Objectives /CE-O3: Values and functions of the coastal environment.  Relates to CE-I1 to CE-I9	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.156	Support	Supports Objective CE-O3: Values and functions of the coastal environment as it includes the protection of cultural and historic values in this Objective.	Retain Objective CE-O3: Values and functions of the coastal environment as notified.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P1: Identify and protect the natural features and natural character of the coastal environment.  Relates to CE-O1, CE-O4, and CE-O5	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.157	Oppose	Opposes Policy CE-P1: Identify and protect the natural features and natural character of the coastal environment as currently drafted as the recognition and protection of heritage values expressed in CE-I1 and CE-O3 have not been brought down into the policy framework.	Seeks to add the following to Policy CE-P1: Identify and protect the natural features and natural character of the coastal environment:  <u>An urban waterfront character with historic heritage values</u>	Open Submission

# CE - Coastal Environment

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
CE - Coastal Environment /Issues /CE-I6: Effects of climate change on the coastal environment.	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.73	Support	Supports I6 as it recognises climate change can threaten public land and infrastructure and ensuring activities don't compromise the coastal processes to provide some degree of protection for existing activities.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /CE - Coastal Environment /Introduction	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.3	Amend	Considers that the proposed plan is not consistent with guiding legislation and policy, in particular s 6(a) to 6(d) of the Act and the NZCPS. Considers it is essential that the plan gives full effect to the protection for the coastal environment contained in the NZCPS as our native wildlife is facing unprecedented pressure from beach users, and addressing these challenges requires stricter control.	Seeks that the Coastal Environment chapter of the plan should give effect to s 6(a) to 6(d) of the Act, and to the provisions of the NZCPS, particularly Policies 3, 11, 13, 14 and 15, and should be consistent with the Hawkes Bay Regional Coastal Environment Plan. The remaining chapters in the Plan must also give effect to the NZCPS.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /CE - Coastal Environment /Introduction	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.3	Amend	Considers that the proposed plan is not consistent with guiding legislation and policy, in particular s 6(a) to 6(d) of the Act and the NZCPS. Considers it is essential that the plan gives full effect to the protection for the coastal environment contained in the NZCPS as our native wildlife is facing unprecedented pressure from beach users, and addressing these challenges requires stricter control.	Seeks that the Coastal Environment chapter of the plan should give effect to s 6(a) to 6(d) of the Act, and to the provisions of the NZCPS, particularly Policies 3, 11, 13, 14 and 15, and should be consistent with the Hawkes Bay Regional Coastal Environment Plan. The remaining chapters in the Plan must also give effect to the NZCPS.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /CE - Coastal Environment - Rules Table /	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.6	Amend	The coastal environment is a key habitat for many of our native species and particularly vulnerable to disturbance caused by high-impact human activity such as private vehicle use on our local beaches. An overwhelmingly proportion of Aotearoa New Zealand's councils have inadequate bylaws, monitoring, and compliance for vehicles on beaches. This means coastal species and their habitats are left vulnerable and unprotected eg Banded Dotterels.	Seeks that NCC enact regulations to significantly reduce the use of beaches by vehicles and restrict dog access to areas known as critical breeding and resting grounds for marine wildlife by amending the objective so while public access is maintained it is controlled in areas that constitute key habitats for indigenous biodiversity.  Seeks that Napier should support efforts to change legislation in New Zealand so that beaches are no longer considered roads and only vehicular use specifically permitted by district councils is allowed.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Introduction /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.138	Oppose	Considers the CE Introduction notes that the chapter does not contain rules to give effect to the CE objectives and policies, rather, rules are found in various other chapters in the plan. Forest & Bird submits that if this approach is going to work, all other relevant chapters need to include CE-specific rules. Only some chapters appear to do this. The Earthworks chapter for example, includes various rules that do not apply any differently within or outside of the coastal environment. The NFL similarly appears to make no distinction. The Subdivision chapter also does not appear to treat subdivision within our outside of the coastal environment any differently, other than for one rule in the Coastal Hazard Zone. The matters of control for many rules are silent on coastal values. The Open Space Zone chapter does contain CE-specific rules, but the Rural Production Zone doesn't. Council needs to undertake a comprehensive review of all chapters to ensure this approach works.	Seeks to amend each chapter to include specific rules managing activities in the coastal environment. These will usually need to be much more stringent than for activities outside the coastal environment, because of the sensitivity of coastal values, and also because of the different higher order policy direction. Most activities will not be appropriate as permitted activities in the coastal environment.  Alternatively, include rules in the CE chapter to achieve the appropriate effects management approach.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Introduction /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.139	Amend	Considers Under Other relevant District Plan provisions:  Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity: Provisions relating to significant natural areas in the coastal environment are located in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter  This is still absent from the notified proposed District Plan	Ensure that when it is notified, the ECO chapter contains CE-specific provisions to give effect to policy 11 NZCPS.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Issues /CE-I1: The values associated with the natural character of the coastal environment are identified and protected from significant adverse effects.	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.140	Amend	Considers the s32 report states that:  "Nevertheless, there are residual areas, natural features, ecosystems, and ecological values that have retained original elements and processes of the environment, along with significant habitats of migratory species providing opportunities to restore the natural character and ecology of the coastal environment."  Forest & Bird questions the statement that there are no high or significant areas of natural character have been identified in the coastal environment. It is unclear how Council arrived at that conclusion, and we submit that Council should undertake a review to ensure that no areas have been missed. Te Whanga, for example, is surely a site of outstanding natural character, and should be identified and protected as such.	Seeks to amend the issue to the effect that, to date, the Council has not yet identified areas of significant or high or outstanding natural character in the coastal environment, but that it will undertake a review to assess this.  Include areas, such as Te Whanga, that have high natural character in the coastal environment in the plan.  Include objectives, policies and rules to ensure any areas of natural character are appropriately protected.	Open Submission

# CE - Coastal Environment

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
CE - Coastal Environment /Issues /CE-13: There has been an incremental loss of indigenous ecosystems, natural character, landscape, and scenic values along extensive areas of the coast.	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.141	Amend	<p>Considers the s32 report states that:</p> <p>“Nevertheless, there are residual areas, natural features, ecosystems, and ecological values that have retained original elements and processes of the environment, along with significant habitats of migratory species providing opportunities to restore the natural character and ecology of the coastal environment.”</p> <p>Forest &amp; Bird questions the statement that there are no high or significant areas of natural character have been identified in the coastal environment. It is unclear how Council arrived at that conclusion, and we submit that Council should undertake a review to ensure that no areas have been missed. Te Whanga, for example, is surely a site of outstanding natural character, and should be identified and protected as such.</p>	<p>Seeks to amend the issue to the effect that, to date, the Council has not yet identified areas of significant or high or outstanding natural character in the coastal environment, but that it will undertake a review to assess this.</p> <p>Include areas, such as Te Whanga, that have high natural character in the coastal environment in the plan.</p> <p>Include objectives, policies and rules to ensure any areas of natural character are appropriately protected.</p>	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Issues /CE-17: The need to protect ecosystems	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.142	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /General /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.143	Amend	<p>Considers amending the whole chapter.</p> <p>It is not yet clear whether the ECO chapter will specifically address indigenous biodiversity in the CE. If it does not,</p> <p>this chapter will need specific objectives, policies and rules to give effect to policy 11 NZCPS.</p>	Seeks to include in either this chapter, or the upcoming ECO chapter, objectives and policies and rules to give effect to policy 11 NZCPS.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Objectives /CE-O1: Avoid adverse effects on natural character.  Relates to CE-11, CE-12, CE-13 CE-14, CE-16, CE-18, and CE-19	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.144	Amend	Support, however questions, whether there are any areas of outstanding natural character that have not been included in the plan. If there are such areas, such as Te Whanga, this objective will need to be amended to give effect to NZCPS policy 13(a).	<p>Retain, but amend to require avoidance of adverse effects on any areas of outstanding natural character in the CE.</p> <p>The objective should also require that other effects (ie on non-outstanding areas of NC) are remedied or mitigated.</p>	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Objectives /CE-O2: Retain public access.  Relates to CE-14, CE-15, CE-16, and CE-17	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.145	Amend	Considers It should be determined what public access looks like. While recreationists going for a walk staying on designated paths has limited impacts on a protected environment, vehicle use or access with dogs may be inappropriate, particularly during critical life cycles such as bird breeding periods and should be avoided.	Seeks to specify extent of public access to ensure that policy 11 and 13 NZCPS are given effect to.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Objectives /CE-O3: Values and functions of the coastal environment.  Relates to CE-11 to CE-19	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.146	Amend	Considers it is not clear that adverse effects will be avoided, remedied or mitigated consistent with the NZCPS.	Amend as follows:“Provide for activities and development in the coastal environment that protect and/or restore the following values and functions where adverse effects can be appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated:...”	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Objectives /CE-O3: Values and functions of the coastal environment.  Relates to CE-11 to CE-19	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.146	Amend	Considers it is not clear that adverse effects will be avoided, remedied or mitigated consistent with the NZCPS.	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>“Provide for activities and development in the coastal environment that protect and/or restore the following values and functions where adverse effects can be appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated:...”</p>	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Objectives /CE-O4: Natural character and mauri  Relates to CE-12, CE-13, CE-14, CE-17, and CE-19	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.147	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Objectives /CE-O6: Integrated management approach.	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.148	Amend	Considers this needs amendment to be able to be applied as a tool to guide decision making. It is not clear how this would apply otherwise.	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>The Plan acknowledges the coastal environment as a significant part of the city which affects and relates to numerous parts of land use activities. The Council is collaborating with the Hawke's Bay Regional Council as well as the Department of Conservation, including. <u>The Plan's objectives for the coastal environment include:</u></p>	Open Submission

# CE - Coastal Environment

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P1: Identify and protect the natural features and natural character of the coastal environment.  Relates to CE-O1, CE-O4, and CE-O5	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.149	Oppose	Considers as per the King Salmon decision what is inappropriate/appropriate is to be determined with respect to the values that are to be protected. Functional need is not relevant to that inquiry.  The policy should also refer to the requirement protect natural character and biodiversity, and manage effects in certain ways.	Amend as follows:  In determining whether an activity may reduce the natural character in the coastal environment, and is inappropriate, particular regard must be given to:  a. <u>the requirement to avoid, remedy or mitigate effects in accordance with policies 11, 13 and 15 NZCPS;</u>  b. <u>the nature and intensity of the proposed activity including:</u>  i. <del>the functional need or operational requirement to locate within the coastal environment, and</del>  ii. <del>the opportunity to mitigate anticipated adverse effects of the activity.</del>  c. the degree to which the natural character will be modified, damaged or destroyed including:  i. the duration and frequency of any <u>effect</u> ;  ii. the magnitude or scale of any <u>effect</u> ;  iii. the irreversibility of adverse effects on natural character values, and/or  iv. whether the activity will lead to cumulative adverse	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P3: Minimise disturbance of natural features and coastal values.  Relates to CE-O1 and CE-O4	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.150	Amend	Considers NZCPS policy 11 and 13 require the protection of biodiversity and natural character in the coastal environment. It is unclear what 'minimal' disturbance will mean. In some cases, even minimal disturbance will produce an adverse effect of concern.  Of specific concern is the current extent of private vehicle use threatening natural features and coastal values	Amend as follows:  Protect <del>Minimise</del> natural features and coastal values <u>by minimising and managing</u> disturbance  The character of the coastal environment is retained by ensuring there is minimal disturbance to the natural contours, coastal vegetation, habitats of indigenous coastal species, and any significant heritage, cultural, and ecological features. <u>In some circumstances, even minimal disturbance will need to be avoided to ensure values are protected.</u>	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P4: Control activities to prevent the incremental loss of biodiversity and natural values.  Relates to CE-O1, CE-O3 and CE-O4	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.151	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission

# CE - Coastal Environment

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P5: Improve the natural character of the coastal environment. Relates to CE-O1, CE-O2, CE-O3, CE-O4, and CE-O5	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.152	Amend	<p>Considers the wording in this policy needs amending to give direction.</p> <p>It is not clear how an activity being compatible with these matters would “improve the natural character of the coastal environment”.</p> <p>For example, providing for ‘Bank stability and areas for the treatment of stormwater’ is not appropriate for a policy aimed at the restoration of natural character. Nor is public access etc relevant to natural character restoration</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Policy 14 of the NZCPS promotes the restoration or rehabilitation of the natural character of the coastal environment where it has been degraded. The use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in the coastal environment <del>must be</del> compatible with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. providing maintaining, and improving ecological corridors;</li> <li>b. <del>public access, open space, recreation, and amenity values;</del></li> <li>c. maintenance of indigenous biodiversity;</li> <li>d. <del>bank stability and areas for the treatment of stormwater;</del></li> <li>e. reinstatement of natural hydrological systems, and</li> <li>f. retaining and restoring natural coastal features, ecosystems, and habitats.</li> </ul>	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P6: Include Māori within integrated management approach. Relates to CE-O1, CE-O4, and CE-O6.	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.153	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P7: Restrict activities within and close to sensitive coastal areas. Relates to CE-O4	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.154	Amend	<p>Considers policy needs to also include that complete avoidance will sometimes be necessary.</p> <p>It would also be helpful to specify here, or in another policy, a non-exhaustive list of the types of activities that will need to be restricted.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>To restrict the location and timing of activities, or require <u>the complete avoidance of activities</u>, ...</p> <p>Consider including a non-exhaustive list of activities to be restricted/avoided.</p> <p>Include rules for these activities, including: private vehicle use on beaches, access of dogs and the establishment of buffer/setback from estuary of at least 20m</p>	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P8: Retain and reinstate natural values in the coastal environment. Relates to CE-O1 and CE-O6	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.155	Amend	Considers reinstate is unclear, restoration is a better term.	Amend to provide for restoration.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P9: Maintain natural buffer areas and setbacks around significant indigenous biodiversity. Relates to CE-O1 and CE-O4	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.156	Amend	<p>Considers policy is supported.</p> <p>However, the policy does not specify buffer/setback in Ahuriri Estuary or the minimum area requirement for those zones. This is acceptable as long as the rules provide that level of detail.</p>	<p>Seels to ensure that rules give effect to this policy.</p> <p>Ensure that rules apply adequate buffers/setbacks (of at least 20m) to be applied to Ahuriri Estuary to protect indigenous biodiversity and other natural environment values.</p>	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P10: Avoid activities in coastal and riparian margins. Relates to CE-O1, CE-O4, and CE-O5	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.157	Amend	Considers the policy is supported; however, it is unclear what ‘undue risk’ means.	Clarify what ‘undue risk’ means.	Open Submission



# CE - Coastal Environment

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P11: Manage pedestrian access to the coast and riparian margins. Relates to CE-O1, CE-O2, and CE-O3	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.158	Amend	Considers the policy does not consider dogs.	Amend as follows:  a. To maintain a high level of pedestrian access to the coast, estuary, rivers and their margins and require any use and development to enhance public access unless there may be:  - potential effects on nesting, breeding or feeding habitats of indigenous species or on natural coastal features, or  - security or public health and safety reasons for restricting that access.  <u>b.To recognise that dog access needs to be restricted in areas where vulnerable indigenous biodiversity is present.</u>  And ensure that rules in the Plan restricts dog access to areas that have vulnerable biodiversity values.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P12: Restrict vehicle access.  Relates to CE-O1, CE-O2, CE-O4, and CE-O5	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.159	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.160	Amend			Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.161	Amend	Considers there is no policy in the CE chapter to give effect to policy 15 NZCPS. We have made submissions to amend the NFL chapter to incorporate this, but there could also be policy direction in this chapter.	Add policy to give effect to Policy 15 of the NZCPS.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /Assessment criteria /CE-AC1: All activities in the coastal environment.	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.162	Amend	Considers the assessment criteria do not refer to the requirement to avoid adverse effects, and in other cases avoid significant effects, and remedy and mitigate other effects. This needs to be included in order to give effect to policies 11, 13 and 15 NZCPS.  For example, for effects on natural character, I. suggests that if development cannot practically be located elsewhere, then development is acceptable. However, the NZCPS requires that significant adverse effects on NC in the CE are avoided, regardless of whether there is another practicable location.  The assessment criteria need to appropriately refer to landscape values, given that the NFL chapter currently doesn't adequately address coastal NFL values.  The assessment criteria for indigenous biodiversity are far too narrow on one hand, and on the other, include irrelevant matters.  Note that courtship and mating at the beginning and fledging towards the end are critical stages within the bird breeding season. Durations of breeding cycles are likely to be impacted due to climate change and may be different for various shore bird species. Consider restrictions during critical bird breeding periods in coastal key habitats between 1 August and 30 March	Amend to make clear that some adverse effects will need to be avoided – regardless of whether the activity contributes to other desired outcomes (e.g. increasing public access) or has a practicable alternative location. This will give effect to the NZCPS. Changes are needed under the eharings 'Effects on natural character...' and 'Effects on indigenous biodiversity', and a new heading is required for 'Effects on natural landscapes' (or incorporate into natural character heading).  The criteria for indigenous biodiversity are far too narrow. They need to be significantly expanded, to ensure that protection in accordance with s6, s30, and policy 11 NZCPS will occur.  They also include two matters that are irrelevant to biodiversity: z. iii. and z.iv should be deleted from the 'Effects on indigenous biodiversity' section, and included elsewhere in the assessment criteria.	Open Submission
CE - Coastal Environment /General /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.163	Oppose	Whole chapter, including Introduction, Objectives, Policies and Rules  Arising from late notification of the ECO-chapter	Seeks to Add:  <u>"The Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter includes provisions which relate to activities in the coastal environment. Where there is a conflict between the Coastal Environment chapter and the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter, the provisions that place greater or additional restrictions on activities with adverse effects on the natural environment will apply"</u> .	Open Submission

# CE - Coastal Environment

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
CE - Coastal Environment /General /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.178	Amend	Notes that the CE objectives and policies are meant to be implemented by rules in the other chapters of the plan, including the area specific chapters.  It is not clear that this has occurred in a comprehensive manner.	Seeks to amend each chapter to include specific rules managing activities in the coastal environment. These will usually need to be much more stringent than for activities outside the coastal environment, because of the sensitivity of coastal values, and also because of the different higher order policy direction. Most activities will not be appropriate as permitted activities in the coastal environment.	Open Submission

# EW - Earthworks

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
EW - Earthworks /Issues / EW-I1: Disturbance of ecosystems, waterways, and productive soils	Wayne Ormsby	63.3	Amend	Considers that EW-I1 must recognise the impacts of network utility operators clearing waterways on eels, and that District Plan provisions must include provisions to protect taonga species (eels) in these circumstances.	Amend EW-I1 so that it acknowledges the impacts network utility operators can have on taonga species (eels) when clearing drains. It is inferred that the submitter also wishes to include provision within the Earthworks chapter that address this issue.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks / /	Rebecca Eng	99.72	Amend	Seeks a specific submission rule within the Network Utilities chapter to manage earthwork activities within the National Grid Yard. Should the submission point be rejected, Transpower seeks the rule within the Earthworks Chapter.	Seeks a specific submission rule within the Network Utilities chapter to manage earthwork activities within the National Grid Yard. Should the submission point be rejected, Transpower seeks the rule within the Earthworks Chapter. Appropriate cross reference would be required in the introduction to the Network Utilities Chapter to make the existence and linkage of the rule evident to plan users.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table /EW-R5: Earthworks or land disturbance for network utilities by a network utility operator, including vehicle access tracks for network utilities	Rebecca Eng	99.74	Amend	Transpower supports the centralisation of all network utilities provisions into the Network Utilities chapter rather than being scattered through the Proposed District Plan. Standard 7(30) of the National Planning Standards states that The Earthworks chapter must include cross-references to any relevant earthworks provisions under Energy, Infrastructure, and Transport heading. In addition to the above relocation issue, Rule EW-R5 requires compliance with Standards S2-S11 but not all are relevant to network utilities: - S2 The cut and fill requirements may unintentionally apply to underground infrastructure when the focus should be on the finished ground level, not the depth of cut or fill which is undertaken in the process of undergrounding. As underground infrastructure spans multiple titles, S2(2) which required setbacks from boundaries is not relevant for network utilities. - S4 For network utility projects it is likely that earthworks will be removed offsite, and this is an unreasonably small limit.	Relocate Rule EW-R5 and the relevant standards into the Network Utilities chapter, and amend remove reference to standards S2 and S4.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table	Sera Chambers	150.115	Oppose	opposes on the basis that any sections of the PDP that reference Site of Significance to Māori, Indigenous Biodiversity, or Natural Hazards, will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not be fit for purpose based on the Plan Variation.	seeks for any sections of the PDP that reference Site of Significance to Māori, Indigenous Biodiversity, or Natural Hazards, will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not be fit for purpose based on the Plan Variation.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table /All zones	Sera Chambers	150.116	Amend	considers that notification should not be precluded for applications under this rule. The adjoining landowner should be notified and be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks to amend to require notification under this rule so that adjoining landowners are notified and able to have their say.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table /All zones	Sera Chambers	150.117	Amend	considers that the rule should be amended to extend to adjoining buildings/land on the basis that adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment. This includes being informed of the works and how long they will be going for.	amend the rule to extend it to cover adjoining buildings/land on the basis that adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table /EW-S7: Control of dust	Sera Chambers	150.307	Amend	considers that the standard should be amended to extend to adjoining buildings/land on the basis that adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment. This includes being informed of the works and how long they will be going for.	amend the standard to extend it to cover adjoining buildings/land on the basis that adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table	Tom Anderson	151.67	Amend	Considers that the zone rules should not apply to network utilities	Amend as follows  Zone rules apply in addition to the activities below ( <u>noting these do not apply to district-wide matters</u> ). Earthworks rules are also found in the following chapters:  ...	Open Submission

# EW - Earthworks

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table /EW-R5: Earthworks or land disturbance for network utilities by a network utility operator, including vehicle access tracks for network utilities	Tom Anderson	151.68	Support	Supports specific earthworks rule for network utilities, but should be located in the NU Chapter.	Retain the rule as drafted but amend to locate it in the NU chapter.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table /All zones	Tom Anderson	151.69	Amend	Considers that earthworks which do not alter the ground level, such as trenching, should not require the same setbacks from streams and overland flow areas. Further, they should be located in the NU chapter.	Amend the standard as follows, and place it in the NU Chapter: ... 1. Cut and fill does not exceed 2.5 m vertically. 2. The cut and fill depth, <u>where at the completion of the earthworks result in a change to the ground level</u> , does not exceed the distance from the nearest site boundary as measured on a horizontal plane. 3. The cut and fill depth does not exceed 1 m vertically where the top of the excavation is within 10 m of buildings or surcharge loads. 4. The cut or fill, <u>where at the completion of the earthworks result in a change to the ground level</u> , is no closer than (measured on a horizontal plane):	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table /EW-R1: Earthworks for building activities	James Witham	165.30	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of the note as it is unclear, particularly that not all building activities that require earthworks are required to obtain building consent and, whether regulatory compliance is required, and subsequently if non-compliance is enforceable by way of resource consent. Considers the installation of fences, equipment and machinery should be exempted as the effects of those day to day activities are less than minor. Considers that requiring these activities to comply does not meet the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Delete note, clarify the provisions for supplying earthworks details is not required for buildings and structures that do not require building consents Exempt the installation of fencing, machinery and equipment for land based primary production activities from the provisions of the Earthworks chapter follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Policies /EW-P1: Allow for earthworks	Sheena McGuire	168.79	Support	Supports policy that seeks to provide for earthworks if the scale, volume and effects are appropriately managed.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table /EW-R1: Earthworks for building activities	Sheena McGuire	168.80	Support	Supports the Permitted Activity status of earthworks for building activities, subject to standards.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table /EW-R3: Earthworks associated with the replacement and/or removal of a fuel storage system as defined in the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011	Sheena McGuire	168.81	Support	Supports the Permitted Activity status of earthworks for network utilities, including access tracks, by a network utility operator. Submitter requires access roads to maintain and upgrade the rail network.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table /EW-S1: Extent of Earthworks	Sheena McGuire	168.82	Support	Supports these standards for earthworks extents in different zones and cut/fill requirements.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table /EW-S2: Earthworks - cut and fill	Sheena McGuire	168.83	Support	Supports these standards for earthworks extents in different zones and cut/fill requirements.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table /EW-S3: Slope stability	Sheena McGuire	168.84	Support	Support this standard to ensure earthworks don't result in land instability at or beyond a site.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table /EW-S5: Control of silt and sediment	Sheena McGuire	168.85	Amend	Supports this standard however, seeks inclusion of the rail corridor. Considers that lineside development can result in uncontrolled silt and sediment entering the rail corridor which can compromise the rail network and threaten the safe operation of trains.	Amend as follows:  1. For the duration of earthworks, measures must be implemented to prevent silt or sediment from entering the stormwater system, overland flow paths, <u>rail corridor</u> or roads.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table /EW-S6: Site reinstatement	Sheena McGuire	168.86	Support	Supports site reinstatement following earthworks to control sediment.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table /EW-R5: Earthworks or land disturbance for network utilities by a network utility operator, including vehicle access tracks for network utilities	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.49	Support	It is appropriate that there is a network utilities rule provided within the earthworks chapter.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission

# EW - Earthworks

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table /EW-S8: Proximity to gas lines	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.50	Support	It is appropriate that this standard refers to gas distribution works.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table /EW-R1: Earthworks for building activities	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.39	Amend	EW-R1A Open Space Zones in the PDP include Open Space and Recreation Zones. Consistent terminology should be used for clarity in plan implementation.	Change reference in clause (c) to 'Open Space Zones' to 'Open Space and Recreation Zones'.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table /EW-R1: Earthworks for building activities	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.78	Amend	<p>EW-R1(2)</p> <p>Rule EW-R1(2) relates to earthworks over 12-month/per hectare rate for just building works (building platform, foundations). If you have a standard 800m<sup>2</sup> residential site the rule allows less than 10m<sup>3</sup> which would trigger a resource consent for earthworks for most building activities. Standard EW-S1 (extent of earthworks) specifies a flat threshold of 50m<sup>3</sup> per site. It would therefore be beneficial to apply EW-R7 in most cases for building on residential sites as it is more permissive; however, EW-R7 does not apply to earthworks for building activities as that is already provided for in the table. The earthworks for building activities threshold (EW-R1(2)) is more restrictive than the general earthworks standard (EW-S1). The different thresholds do not appear to be effects-based nor supported by the policy direction.</p> <p>Consider amending the earthworks for building activities thresholds to be per hectare per site for rural zones, and just per site for the urban zones. This will meet the intent of being more enabling for building activities than the general zone thresholds, however will recognise that for smaller sites a per hectare ratio doesn't work. Also reconsider the application of thresholds for the Settlement and Ahuriri Estuary Special Zones to ensure they're consistent with the nature of development anticipated in the zone.</p>	<p>Amend as follows (or similar relief):</p> <p>The extent of earthworks for building activities for any 12-month period (<del>per hectare per site</del>) is:</p> <p>a) Rural Production Zone, Rural Lifestyle, Airport Zone, Mission Precincts (all), <del>Settlement Zone</del>, Jervois Precinct, Rural Special Control Area, Tertiary Education Zone, and Wastewater Treatment Specific Control Area – 200 m<sup>3</sup> <u>per hectare per site</u>.</p> <p>b) All Residential Zones and Precincts, <u>the Settlement Zone</u>, all Development Areas, all Commercial and Mixed Use Zones and Precincts, all Industrial Zones and Precincts, Boat Harbour Zone, Maori Purpose Zone, Port Zone, <del>and Ahuriri Estuary Special Zone</del> – 100 m<sup>3</sup> <u>per site</u>.</p> <p>c) Open Space Zones <u>and Te Whanganui a Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Stormwater and Ecology Zone</u> – 2000 m<sup>3</sup> <u>per hectare per site</u>.</p>	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /General /General	Ellen Robotham	198.46	Support	Generally supportive of the Earthworks chapter.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table /General	Ellen Robotham	198.47	Support	Generally supportive of the Earthworks Chapter and supports provisions which require the management of dust effects across all zones. It is critical to the safety and operation of the Airport that earthworks are appropriately managed. This is due to the potential for earthworks to give rise to dust effects, which can reduce visibility for pilots, and can also be drawn into the engines causing gradual damage. Poorly managed earthworks that result in standing pools of water can also act as a bird attractant which can increase the potential for bird strike. Accordingly, HBAL submits that controls to this effect should be included in the Proposed Plan.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table /EW-S6: Site reinstatement	Ellen Robotham	198.48	Amend	Generally supportive of the Earthworks Chapter and supports provisions which require the management of dust effects across all zones. It is critical to the safety and operation of the Airport that earthworks are appropriately managed. This is due to the potential for earthworks to give rise to dust effects, which can reduce visibility for pilots, and can also be drawn into the engines causing gradual damage. Poorly managed earthworks that result in standing pools of water can also act as a bird attractant which can increase the potential for bird strike. Accordingly, HBAL submits that controls to this effect should be included in the Proposed Plan.	<p>Amend EW-S6 as follows:</p> <p>As soon as practicable, but no later than six months from the commencement of earthworks:</p> <p>a) The earthworks area shall be stabilised, filled and/or recontoured in a manner consistent with the surrounding land <u>and to remediate any standing pools of water;</u></p>	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Objectives /EW-O1: Environment (soils, ecosystems, waterways)	Georgina McPherson	215.98	Support	The Fuel Companies support EW-O1 as notified.	Retain EW-O1 as notified.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Objectives /EW-O3: Hazards and health and safety	Georgina McPherson	215.99	Support	The Fuel Companies support EW-O3 as notified.	Retain EW-O3 as notified.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Policies /EW-P1: Allow for earthworks	Georgina McPherson	215.100	Support	The Fuel Companies particularly support earthworks being a permitted activity where effects are appropriately managed.	Retain EW-P1 as notified.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Policies /EW-P2: Environment	Georgina McPherson	215.101	Support	The Fuel Companies support EW-P2 as notified	Retain EW-P2 as notified.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Policies /EW-P6: Cultural and heritage values	Georgina McPherson	215.102	Support	The Fuel Companies support EW-P6 as notified.	Retain EW-P6 as notified	Open Submission

# EW - Earthworks

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table /EW-R1: Earthworks for building activities	Georgina McPherson	215.103	Support	The Fuel Companies support EW-R1A provided that the changes sought to the Earthworks standards that seek to avoid conflict with the NESCS, are accepted.	Retain EW-R1A as notified.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table /EW-R1: Earthworks for building activities	Georgina McPherson	215.104	Amend	The Fuel Companies generally support the intent of EW-R1B but seek a new matter of discretion that accounts for benefits associated with earthworks activities.	Amend EW-R1B as follows:  Matters of discretion are:  1. The matters of discretion of the effects standard infringed; 2. .... 6. Natural hazards,, and 7. Health and safety., and 8. <u>Benefits associated with the earthworks.</u>	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table /EW-R3: Earthworks associated with the replacement and/or removal of a fuel storage system as defined in the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011	Georgina McPherson	215.105	Amend	Generally support, with the exception of the requirement for earthworks associated with fuel tank replacement and/or removal to comply with EW-S4 relating to the removal of soil from a site, as this matter is specifically controlled under the NESCS.	Amend EW-R3 to remove the requirement for replacement or removal of a fuel storage system to comply with standard EW-S4, as follows:  EW-R3: Earthworks associated with the replacement and/or removal of a fuel storage system as defined in the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011  All zones EW-R3A  Activity status: Permitted Where:  Compliance with the Earthworks effects standardsEW- S3 and EW-S5– EW-S8.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table /EW-R5: Earthworks or land disturbance for network utilities by a network utility operator, including vehicle access tracks for network utilities	Georgina McPherson	215.106	Support	The Fuel Companies support the permitted activity status for network utilities. The Fuel Companies also support that EW-S1 is not required to be met under this rule.The default to RD status is also supported.	Retain EW-R5 as notified.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table /EW-R7: Earthworks not otherwise provided for in this table	Georgina McPherson	215.107	Support	The Fuel Companies support the permissive approach to earthworks not otherwise provided for, together with the default to RD status where compliance with the earthworks standards is not achieved	Retain EW-R7 as notified.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table / EW-S1: Extent of Earthworks	Georgina McPherson	215.108	Amend	The intent of this standard is generally supported. However, the Fuel Companies seek an additional matter of discretion that accounts for any benefits associated with an earthwork activity.	Amend EW-S1 as follows:  Matters of discretion are:  1. Sediment control for the protection of waterways; 2. ... 5. Natural hazards,, and 6. Health and safety., and 7. <u>Benefits associated with the earthworks.</u>	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table /EW-S2: Earthworks - cut and fill	Georgina McPherson	215.109	Amend	The intent of this standard is generally supported. However, the Fuel Companies seek an additional matter of discretion that accounts for any benefits associated with an earthwork activity.	Amend EW-S2 as follows:  Matters of discretion are:  1. Purpose of the standard; 2. ... 6. Natural hazards,, and 7. Health and safety., and 8. <u>Benefits associated with the earthworks.</u>	Open Submission

# EW - Earthworks

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table /EW-S3: Slope stability	Georgina McPherson	215.110	Amend	The intent of this standard is generally supported. However, the Fuel Companies seek an additional matter of discretion that accounts for any benefits associated with an earthwork activity.	<p>Amend EW-S3 as follows:</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Purpose of the standard;</li> <li>...</li> <li>Natural hazards,; and</li> <li>Health and safety., and</li> <li><u>8. Benefits associated with the earthworks.</u></li> </ol>	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table /EW-S4: Removal off site	Georgina McPherson	215.111	Amend	The Fuel Companies seek that EW-S4 is amended to include an exemption for activities which are regulated under the National Environmental Standards for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011 (NESCS). This will avoid conflict with the NESCS, which allows for 5m3 per 500m2 to be taken away per year and soil to be taken for the purpose of laboratory analysis as a permitted activity.The Fuel Companies also seek an additional matter of discretion that accounts for any benefits associated with the earthworks activity.	<p>Amend EW-S4 as follows:</p> <p>Rural Productive Zone</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Earthworks result in the removal off site of no more than 25 m3 of earth materials per 12 month period.</li> </ol> <p>All other zones</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Earthworks result in the removal off site of no more than 100 m3 of earth materials per 12 month period.</li> </ol> <p><u>Except that this standard does not apply to activities regulated under the National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health Regulations 2011.</u></p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The purpose of the standard, and</li> <li>Protection of productive soils,; and</li> <li><u>3. Benefits associated with the earthworks.</u></li> </ol>	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table /EW-S5: Control of silt and sediment	Georgina McPherson	215.112	Amend	The intent of this standard is generally supported. However, the requirement to entirely prevent silt or sediment from entering the stormwater system is considered too absolute and unlikely to be able to be achieved in all situations. As suggested approach would be to require implementation of best practice silt and sediment control measures to reduce the risk of silt and sediment becoming entrained in stormwater. Further, the Fuel Companies seek an additional matter of discretion that accounts for any benefits associated with an earthwork activity.	<p>Amend EW-S5 as follows:</p> <p>EW-S5: Control of silt and sediment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the duration of earthworks, <u>best practice silt and sediment control</u> measures must be implemented to <u>reduce the risk of prevent</u> silt or sediment from entering the stormwater system, overland flow paths, or roads.</li> </ol> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Purpose of the standard;</li> <li>Sediment control for the protection of waterways;</li> <li>Natural hazards,; <del>and</del></li> <li>Health and Safety, <u>and</u></li> <li><u>5. Benefits associated with the earthworks.</u></li> </ol>	Open Submission

# EW - Earthworks

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table /EW-S6: Site reinstatement	Georgina McPherson	215.113	Amend	The intent of this standard is generally supported. However, the Fuel Companies seek an additional matter of discretion that accounts for any benefits associated with an earthwork activity.	Amend EW-S6 as follows:  Matters of discretion are:  1. Purpose of the standard;  2. ...  5. Natural hazards; <del>and</del>  6. Health and safety, <u>and</u>  7. <u>Benefits associated with the earthworks.</u>	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table /EW-S7: Control of dust	Georgina McPherson	215.114	Amend	The intent of this standard is generally supported. However, the Fuel Companies seek an additional matter of discretion that accounts for any benefits associated with an earthwork activity.	Amend EW-S6 as follows:  Matters of discretion are:  1. Purpose of the standard;  2. ...  4. Natural hazards; <del>and</del>  5. Health and safety, <u>and</u>  6. <u>Benefits associated with the earthworks.</u>	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table /EW-S8: Proximity to gas lines	Georgina McPherson	215.115	Support	The intent of this standard is supported.The Fuel Companies also seek an additional matter of discretion that accounts for any benefits associated with an earthwork activity.	Retain EW-S8. Add a new assessment criteria that accounts for the benefits associated with earthworks.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Assessment criteria /General	Georgina McPherson	215.116	Support	The intent of the general information requirements and EW-AC1 are supported.	Retain the general information requirements and EW-AC1.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table / EW-S1: Extent of Earthworks	Sam Goddard	238.4	Oppose	Opposes the proposed maximum of 50m <sup>3</sup> of earthworks for business and industrial zones. Considers that this limit does not reflect the generally larger scale of sites and required earthworks to enable business and industrial activities	Amend to enable a larger volume of earthworks as a permitted activity within business and industrial zones, up to 2,500m <sup>3</sup> per site, per 12 month period.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table /EW-S3: Slope stability	Sam Goddard	238.5	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of site stability as a standard to be complied with within EW – S3. It is considered more appropriate for potential stability effects to be assessed as a matter of discretion for earthworks with a slope greater than 22 degrees	Amend EW – S3 as below:  1. Earthworks shall not be undertaken on land with a slope greater than 22 degrees 2. Earthworks must not result in any instability of land or structures at or beyond the boundary of the site where earthworks occur.  Matters of discretion are:  1. Purpose of the standard; 2. Sediment control for the protection of waterways; 3. Visual impacts and landscape values; 4. Heritage and cultural values; 5. Ecological values; 6. Natural hazards, and 7. Health and safety, and 8. Stability of surrounding land and structures	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Objectives /EW-O1: Environment (soils, ecosystems, waterways)	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.58	Support	Supports EW - Earthworks Objective EW-O1: Environment (soils, ecosystems, waterways) as providing for, or enabling earthworks, given that they are more often than not associated with all development activities is supported. It is also agreed that earthworks should not put at risk the life-supporting capacity soils, nor the health and well-being of ecosystems and waterways.	Retain Objective EW-O1 as notified.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Objectives /EW-O3: Hazards and health and safety	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.59	Support	Supports Objective EW-O3: Hazards and health and safety as it is appropriate to ensure that earthworks do not exacerbate any natural hazard risks or put the health and safety of people and property at risk.	Retain Objective EW-O3 as notified.	Open Submission



# EW - Earthworks

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
EW - Earthworks /Policies /EW-P1: Allow for earthworks	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.60	Support	Supports Policy EW-P1: Allow for earthworks as providing for, or allowing, earthworks provided appropriate controls are in place appropriately avoids unnecessary regulatory control of development activities.	Retain Policy EW-P1 as notified.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Policies /EW-P2: Environment	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.61	Support	Supports EW-P2: Environment as although this policy restates and expands on aspects of Policy EW-P1, it is appropriate to ensure that the potential effects of earthworks are appropriately managed. It is considered that the management mechanisms identified within this policy reflect the matters to be considered when setting regulatory controls for earthworks.	Retain Policy EW-P2 as notified.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Policies /EW-P5: Natural hazards	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.62	Support	Supports EW-P5: Natural hazards as it is appropriate to require earthworks to be designed and carried out in a manner that does not undermine the stability of land, buildings and structures, and does not exacerbate any natural hazard risks.	Retain Policy EW-P5 as notified.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table /EW-R1: Earthworks for building activities	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.63	Amend	Considers EW- Earthworks Rule EW-R1: Earthworks for building activities should be amended as the volume limits are too restrictive. The volume limit of 100m <sup>3</sup> in industrial zones does not reflect the nature of large-scale building development that can establish in the industrial zones (i.e., 100m <sup>3</sup> could only provide for a small building of around 10m by 10m, with 1m depth of earthworks for foundations). In addition, the limit does not recognise the controls that will be in place through compliance with the Standards.Given the issues associated with the volume limit that applies to industrial zones and following a review of volume limits in other district plans that have become operative relatively recently, a 2,500m <sup>3</sup> volume limit is being requested by Ravensdown. This is consistent with the district level earthworks rules in industrial zones in the Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in part.	Amend Rule EW-R1A by increasing the volume limit, that applies to all industrial zones, from 100m <sup>3</sup> to 2,500m <sup>3</sup> .	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table /EW-R7: Earthworks not otherwise provided for in this table	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.64	Support	Supports Rule EW-R7: Earthworks not otherwise provided for in the table as providing a permitted activity pathway for all other earthworks, provided the controls contained in the standards are met (subject to the various amendments sought through this submission), is considered appropriate and is consistent with the relevant EW objectives and policies. Restricted discretionary activity is also appropriate in circumstances where the EW standards are not complied with.	Retain Rule EW-R7 as notified.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table /EW-R7: Earthworks not otherwise provided for in this table	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.65	Oppose			Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table /EW-S2: Earthworks - cut and fill	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.66	Support	Supports EW - Earthworks - Standards Table EW-S2: Earthworks - cut and fill as this standard specifies maximum vertical and horizontal cut and fill depth/heights and setbacks.These standards represent appropriate controls on earthworks cut and fill activities and are consistent with relevant EW objectives and policies.	Retain Standard EW-S2 as notified.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table /EW-S4: Removal off site	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.67	Oppose	Opposes Standard EW-S1 4: Removal off site as discussed above in relation to Rule EW-R1 and Standard EW-S1, as it is considered that this volume is potentially too restrictive. A revised volume limit of 2,500m <sup>3</sup> is requested, as this volume is consistent with the increased volume restrictions requested for Rule EW-R1 and Standard EW-S1.(Inferred relief requested)	Amend Standard EW-S4 by increasing the volume limit, that applies to all industrial zones, from 100m <sup>3</sup> per 12-month period to 2,500m <sup>3</sup> per 12-month period.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table /EW-S5: Control of silt and sediment	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.68	Support	Supports EW - Earthworks Standard EW-S5: Control of silt and sediment as this standard, which applies to all zones, requires control measures to be put in place so silt and sediment does not enter stormwater systems, overland flow paths or roads.This standard represents best practice control measures for earthworks and is therefore supported.	Retain Standard EW-S5 as notified.	Open Submission

# EW - Earthworks

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table /EW-S6: Site reinstatement	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.69	Amend	Considers that Standard EW-S6: Site reinstatement should be amended as the requirement to reinstate the site six-months after commencement, rather than after completion, seems illogical. That is, the earthworks may not have been completed within six-months of the earthworks commencing, particularly for larger-scale developments. On this basis, it is considered that the standard should require reinstatement of earthwork sites within six-months of the completion of the earthworks.	Amend Standard EW-S6 as follows:  1. As soon as practicable, but no later than six months <del>from the commencement</del> <u>after the completion</u> of earthworks: ...	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table /EW-S7: Control of dust	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.70	Support	Supports Standard EW-S7: Control of dust as this standard, which applies to all zones, requires control measures to be put in place to manage and minimise potential dust generation.This standard represents best practice control measures for earthworks and is therefore supported.	Retain Standard EW-S7 as notified in its entirety.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Policies /General	Leanne Roberts	257.45	Amend	Seeks that a policy, which recognises the beneficial outcomes of earthworks (including ancillary rural earthworks) is provided.	Seeks to include new policy:  <u>EW-PX - Enable earthworks to provide for people and communities social, economic and cultural well-being, and their health and safety, including ancillary rural earthworks, where adverse effects are appropriately managed.</u>	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table /General	Leanne Roberts	257.46	Amend	Seek a permitted activity rule be included for ancillary rural earthworks to provide for rural activities.	Seeks to include new rule:  <u>EW-RX Ancillary Rural Earthworks</u> <u>Rural Lifestyle Zone</u> <u>Rural Production Zone</u> <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u>	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table /General	Leanne Roberts	257.47	Amend	Seeks a permitted activity rule be included for earthworks associated with a biosecurity response.	Seeks to include new rule:  <u>EW-RX The burying of material infected by unwanted organisms as declared by the Ministry for Primary Industries Chief Technical Officer or an emergency declared by the Minister under the Biosecurity Act 1993</u> <u>All zones</u> <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u>	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table / EW-S1: Extent of Earthworks	Nichola Nicholson	264.2	Support	Supports in principle the proposed approach to the maximum volume thresholds as opposed to a permitted activity with a percentage value.	No relief sought. Retain standard as notified (Inferred).	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table /EW-R6: Earthworks associated with the renourishment of the coastal environment to mitigate the effects of coastal erosion	Nichola Nicholson	264.3	Oppose	HBRC opposes this rule, specifically in relation to the permitted activity status for earthworks associated with the renourishment of the coastal environment. These concerns arise firstly around the potential for permitted earthworks within the coastal margin, and the type of material that could be used for the renourishment. HBRC would expect that both of these at minimum would be a controlled activity.	The submitter wishes to seek clarification. Change activity status to controlled activity as a minimum (Inferred).	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Introduction /General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.158	Support	Supports EW - Earthworks Introduction mention of archaeological sites and the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014.	Retain EW - Earthworks Introduction as notified.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Issues /EW-I3: Cultural, natural, heritage values	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.159	Oppose	Opposes Issues EW-I3: Cultural, natural, heritage values as text under this issue refers to 'provisions that control earthworks' in areas containing cultural, natural and heritage values, as being found in area specific chapters.This is incorrect in relation to earthworks within sites containing scheduled heritage items, archaeological items or heritage precincts. Earthworks have the potential to create adverse effects on heritage values and district plan should contain rules to control earthworks in these areas. The provisions can be included either in earthworks chapter or heritage section at present such provisions are lacking from PDP.	Seeks to retain EW-I3: Cultural, natural, heritage values but include rules relating to the effects of earthworks on heritage values in either the earthworks or heritage section of the district plan.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Objectives /EW-O2: Landscapes, significant natural areas, cultural and heritage value	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.160	Support	Supports Objective EW-O2: Landscapes, significant natural areas, cultural and heritage values as it refers to protecting heritage values.	Retain Objective EW-O2: Landscapes, significant natural areas, cultural and heritage values as notified.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
EW - Earthworks /Policies /EW-P6: Cultural and heritage values	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.161	Amend	Considers Policy EW-P6: Cultural and heritage values is supported and should also include a clause to address heritage values of scheduled places.	Amend Policy EW-P6: Cultural and heritage values as follows:  <u>d. controlling earthworks on sites containing scheduled heritage items.</u>	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table /EW-R1: Earthworks for building activities	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.162	Oppose	Opposes EW-R1: Earthworks for building activities as this Rule is not considered to provide for the appropriate protection and management of heritage values on sites containing scheduled heritage items or archaeological sites, as referred to in EW-O2. It is possible that earthworks could directly or indirectly have an effect on scheduled heritage items. Earthworks near heritage items containing buildings / structures pre-dating 1900 have higher potential of encountering archaeology.	Seeks to amend EW-R1: Earthworks for building activities Permitted Activity as follows:  <u>3. the site does not include a heritage item identified in SCHED-03</u>	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Assessment criteria / EW-AC1: All earthworks not meeting permitted activity standards or rule conditions	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.163	Amend	HNZPT considers implicit consideration of an Accidental Discovery Protocol is supported with an amendment preferable to highlight this provision through a heading titled: Accidental Discovery of Sensitive Material. Regarding point (c) under Recommencement of work, the only archaeological sites that are not covered by the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Act 2014 are post-1900 sites which have been recorded in the New Zealand Archaeological Association database, except for those for which a declaration was made pursuant to s43(1) of the HNZPTA. This should be clarified in this clause. Including the definition of archaeological sites in the District Plan would also serve to clarify the meanings in this section.	Amend EW-AC1: All earthworks not meeting permitted activity standards or rule conditions Recommencement of Work as follows:  Highlight this provision through a heading titled: <u>Accidental Discovery of Sensitive Material</u>  Amend point c. to read:  There are no requirements in the case of <u>post-1900 recorded archaeological sites that are ...</u>	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /General /General	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.74	Amend	Acknowledges that Council seeks to balance the adverse effects of earthworks with the need to undertake construction however, considers the permitted volumes are too low for construction and maintenance works.	Increase the permitted volumes of earthworks to reflect the scale of construction and maintenance requirements of network utilities outside of their corridor designations to 700m3.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table / EW-S1: Extent of Earthworks	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.75	Amend	Acknowledges that Council seeks to balance the adverse effects of earthworks with the need to undertake construction, however considers that the permitted volumes are too low for construction and maintenance works.	Increase the permitted volumes of earthworks to reflect the scale of construction and maintenance requirements of network utilities outside of their corridor designations to 700m3	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table /EW-R1: Earthworks for building activities	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.76	Support	Supports R1 as it allows for earthworks as a permitted activity where the scale, volume and effects are appropriately managed. Considers that this would allow us to undertake earthworks in accordance with our designation.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Standards Table / EW-S1: Extent of Earthworks	Kainga Ora - Brendon Liggett	285.22	Oppose	Opposes the proposed Earthworks standards limiting the permitted volume of earthworks to 50m3 per site, for any 12-month period, across all residential zones and precincts (EW-S1). Submitter acknowledges this is reflective of the operative provisions, however seeks that this be increased to 250m3, to ensure that a level of land disturbance, consistent with the level of development anticipated through the PDP, is provided for as a permitted activity.	Increase to 250m3, to ensure that a level of land disturbance, consistent with the level of development anticipated through the PDP, is provided for as a permitted activity.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Introduction /	Dr. Chantal Page Natasha Sitarz	289.164	Amend	Considers earthworks can also have impacts on indigenous biodiversity. This chapter lacks a section in the Introduction alerting the plan user to other relevant chapters.	Amend as follows:  - Adverse effects on natural features and landscapes, <u>indigenous biodiversity</u> , and amenity and cultural values  Amend to include reference to all other relevant chapters that may apply.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Objectives /EW-O1: Environment (soils, ecosystems, waterways)	Dr. Chantal Page Natasha Sitarz	289.165	Amend	Considers the reference to 'reasonable development opportunities' is unclear.	Amend as follows:  Enable earthworks necessary to support <u>appropriate reasonable</u> development <del>opportunities</del> while ensuring that the life-supporting capacity of soils, ecosystems, and waterways are protected.	Open Submission

# EW - Earthworks

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
EW - Earthworks /Objectives /EW-O2: Landscapes, significant natural areas, cultural and heritage values	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.166	Amend	Considers the objective refers to significant landscapes, which does not correspond with the terms used in the plan.The objective should refer to all sensitive environments that need protection from the effects of earthworks.	Amend to include all areas of natural and other value that need protection, e.g.:  Landscapes <u>and features,the coastal environment</u> , significant natural areas, cultural and heritage values  Earthworks are managed so that <u>significant outstanding and special character</u> landscapes <u>and features</u> , significant natural areas, <u>the coastal environment including areas of natural character</u> ,and cultural and heritage values are protected.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Objectives /EW-O3: Hazards and health and safety	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.167	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Objectives /EW-O4: River control and drainage works	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.168	Amend	Considers this objective is not worded in a way that gives direction to decision makers.This objective should also give effect to Policy 7 NPSFM	Amend as follows:  Earthworks related to river control and drainage works and renourishment of material along the coast by a local authority <u>should be provided for where appropriate are necessary</u> to ensure flood protection duties can be exercised and risks of erosion mitigated, while avoiding the loss of river extent and values to the extent practicable.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Policies /EW-P1: Allow for earthworks	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.169	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Policies /EW-P2: Environment	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.170	Amend	Considers effects on natural waterbodies should be specifically managed.The policy should also recognise that certain natural areas will need to be avoided, in order to protect their values.	Amend c: “providing adequate setbacks from site boundaries, <del>or</del> structures, <u>SNAs, areas of natural character in the coastal environment, and natural waterbodies</u> ”;  Amend e: “controlling the movement of dust and sediment beyond the area of development, particularly to avoid nuisance effects on neighbouring sites, silt and sediment entering stormwater systems <u>or natural waterbodies</u> , or impacting on overland flow paths and/or roads.”	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Policies /EW-P3: Natural landforms, features, drainage patterns, indigenous vegetation	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.171	Amend	The policy needs to avoid the listed impacts, not simply ‘consider’ them.	Amend by replacing ‘that consider’ with <u>‘that avoid’</u> .	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Policies /EW-P4: Visual amenity	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.172	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Policies /EW-P5: Natural hazards	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.173	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /Policies /EW-P7: River control and drainage works	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.174	Amend	Considers this policy should give effect to Policy 7 NPSFM, and should reflect that there may be other adverse effects that need consideration. A simple ‘enable’ direction is opposed.	Amend as follows:  <del>Enable</del> <u>Provide for</u> earthworks activities associated with river control and drainage works to be carried out by local authorities <u>where appropriate, and while avoiding the loss of river extent and values to the extent practicable.</u>	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /General /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.175	Oppose	Whole chapter, including Introduction, Objectives, Policies and RulesArising from late notification of ECO-chapter	Seeks to add: “The Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter includes provisions which relate to earthworks. Where there is a conflict between the Earthworks chapter and the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter, the provisions that place greater or additional restrictions on activities with adverse effects on the natural environment will apply.”	Open Submission

# EW - Earthworks

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table /General	Dr. Chantal Page  Natasha Sitarz	289.176	Amend	Seek exclusion from all Permitted activities for EW in SCLs, ONFs, SCFs, SNAs and the Coastal Environment. We note again that the CE chapter relies on the other chapters in the plan to give effect to the objectives and policies of the CE chapter, but the EW rules do not provide for specific management in the coastal environment.	Seek new rules making all earthworks in SCLs, SCFs, ONF, SNAs and the Coastal Environment non-complying.  Notification should not be precluded for any activity in these areas.  Should any earthworks remain as restricted discretionary, ensure that the matters of discretion include natural character in the coastal environment.	Open Submission
EW - Earthworks /EW - Earthworks - Rules Table /General	Dr. Chantal Page  Natasha Sitarz	289.177	Amend	We seek that the ECO chapter is also listed as a relevant chapter, and a statement that where there is a conflict, the more restrictive provisions applies.	Amend in line with submission point.	Open Submission

# LIGHT - Light

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LIGHT - Light /LIGHT - Light - Standards Table /LIGHT-S3 Table 1: Maximum height of light support structures in a zone	Sera Chambers	150.118	Amend	considers that Stadium, Airport, and Port zones require height limits to allow adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say on this, to allow the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the options to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	amend the standard to include height limits for Stadium, Airport, and Ports Zones.	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light /Objectives /LIGHT-O1: Appropriate lighting activities	Sheena McGuire	168.87	Support	Supports this objective that provides for artificial lighting to be used for operational and functional purposes and to provide for the security and safety of people and properties.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light /Policies /LIGHT-P1: Adverse effects of artificial lighting on the amenity and character of areas	Sheena McGuire	168.88	Support	Supports this policy that enables the appropriate level of artificial light for operation and functional purposes.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light/Policies/LIGHT-P2: Adverse effects of artificial lighting	Sheena McGuire	168.89	Support	Supports this policy which requires artificial lighting to be located, designed and operated to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the transport network.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light/Policies/LIGHT-P3: Appropriate lighting activities	Sheena McGuire	168.90	Amend	Supports this policy but seeks inclusion of rail signals.	Amend as follows:  Recognise the positive effects of lighting for the safety of the community by enabling: a. traffic <u>and rail</u> signals and navigation aids; b. lights of vehicles, trains and aircraft, and c. temporary lighting for the purposes of emergency response.	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light /LIGHT - Light - Rules Table	Sheena McGuire	168.91	Amend	Supports this rule but seeks inclusion of rail signals.	Amend as follows:  LIGHT-R2: Traffic <u>and rail</u> signals and navigation aids; lights of vehicles, trains and aircraft; and temporary lighting for the purposes of emergency response.	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light/Standards Table	Sheena McGuire	168.92	Amend	Supports this standard for light spill and lighting design but seeks amendment to the exemptions for this standard to include rail as well as roads.	Amend as follows:  1. Light spill conditions for all land uses other than for the purposes of illuminating a road or rail corridor:	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light/LIGHT - Lighting - Standards Table	Cameron Drury	170.9	Amend	Considers it advantageous to enable packing down of equipment following activities in a safe environment.	Amend so as to increase the number of days in LIGHT-S1: Stadium Zone 1(b) to 5 days and the duration to 12.00pm.	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light/:IGHT - Light - Standards Table	Cameron Drury	170.10	Amend	Considers it necessary to enable packing down of equipment following activities in a safe environment.	Seeks to amend to increase the number of days in LIGHT-S1: Stadium Zone 1(b) to 5 days and the duration to 12.00pm for to Section SO 9752the Church Road concert venue.	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light/LIGHT - Light - Standards Table/LIGHT-S1: Light spill and lighting design	Mark Leggett	180.7	Oppose	Considers that it is unclear from the table whether light spill and lighting design requirements set out in Standard LIGHT-S1 apply in the PORTZ Zone. Notes that it is assumed that it is not intended that such standards do apply in the PORTZ Zone given the operational needs of this area and that the PORTZ Zone is not mentioned in the left hand column. Supports if assumption is correct but seeks an explicit statement to this effect would provide additional clarity and certainty.	<b>Amend</b> Standard LIGHT-S1 to include the following statement:  <u>'This standard does not apply to sites located in the PORTZ – Port Zone.'</u>	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light/LIGHT - Light - Standards Table	Mark Leggett	180.8	Oppose	Notes that the table indicates that for 'All Special Purpose Zones' the maximum height of light support structures in a zone must not exceed 20m in height, but also states that for the 'Port Zone' no height limit applies. Notes that it is assumed that the second, more specific reference is the correct one, where the PORTZ Zone is concerned. Seeks rearranged table for clarity.	<b>Amend</b> LIGHT-S3 Table 1 by rearranging it to clarify that the 20m height limit only applies in Special Purpose Zones other than those specifically listed (where no height limit applies).	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light/LIGHT - Light - Standards Table	Alan Petersen	187.37	Amend	Light spill for all commercial, industrial, and Rural Zones and Precincts – Agree with item c. in regard to residential activities. The Port needs to ensure light spill is minimised on residential areas in the Port Noise Zones.	Light spill for all commercial, industrial, and Rural Zones and Precincts – Agree with item c. in regard to residential activities. The Port needs to ensure light spill is minimised on residential areas in the Port Noise Zones.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LIGHT - Light /General /General	Ellen Robotham	198.49	Oppose	<p>Civil Aviation regulations largely govern lighting requirements within the aircraft operational areas of Hawke’s Bay Airport. Beyond these areas, both within the Airport Zone and beyond, poorly managed lighting can pose a significant safety risk to aircraft on approach and take off.</p> <p>As currently drafted, the objectives within the Light chapter focus on operational and functional purposes, safety security and amenity. Subsequent policies, rules and methods make either tacit or explicit reference to the potential effects of lighting on aircraft, as well as the effects of aircraft lighting.</p> <p>As drafted, insufficient recognition is afforded to the potential effects of lighting on aircraft safety and a disconnect exists between the objectives, policies and methods. The objectives do not recognise the potential effect of poorly managed lighting on aircraft operations. The policies and standards seek to avoid adverse effects of lighting on the safety of aircraft, however it is unclear which objective such provisions are giving effect to. The matters of discretion do not include consideration of aircraft safety effects, despite being included as a standard, nor do the assessment criteria applying to discretionary activities.</p> <p>There are significant gaps within the lighting framework as it relates to the potentially adverse effect on aircraft operations and safety and seeks that the Light chapter be reworked to addressed the matters raised above and the relevance of policies and rules that seek to enable lighting vehicles, trains and aircraft and considers this is best left to the relevant legislation that governs each. are questioned.</p>	No relief sought.	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light /Objectives /LIGHT-O2: Adverse effects of artificial lighting on the amenity and character of areas	Ellen Robotham	198.50	Oppose	<p>The chapter needs to appropriately reflect the risk of poorly managed lighting on aircraft safety. Civil Aviation regulations largely govern lighting requirements within the aircraft operational areas of Hawke’s Bay Airport. Beyond these areas, both within the Airport Zone and beyond, poorly managed lighting can pose a significant safety risk to aircraft on approach and take off.</p> <p>As currently drafted, the objectives within the Light chapter focus on operational and functional purposes, security, safety and amenity. Subsequent policies, rules and methods make either tacit or explicit reference to the potential effects of lighting on aircraft, as well as the effects of aircraft lighting.</p> <p>As drafted, insufficient recognition is afforded to the potential effects of lighting on aircraft safety and a disconnect exists between the objectives, policies and methods. The objectives do not recognise the potential effect of poorly managed lighting on aircraft operations. The policies and standards seek to avoid adverse effects of lighting on the safety of aircraft, however it is unclear which objective such provisions are giving effect to. The matters of discretion (which apply when a standard is breached) do not include consideration of aircraft safety effects, despite being included as a standard, nor do the assessment criteria applying to discretionary activities.</p> <p>There are significant gaps within the lighting framework as it relates to the potentially adverse effect on aircraft operations and safety and seeks that the Light chapter be reworked to addressed the matters raised above. The relevance of policies and rules that seek to enable lighting vehicles, trains and aircraft and considers this is best left to the relevant legislation that governs</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>LIGHT-O2: Adverse effects of artificial lighting on <u>aircraft safety</u> and the amenity and character of areas</p> <p>Artificial lighting is located, designed, and operated to maintain <u>aircraft safety</u>, character and amenity values.</p>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LIGHT - Light /Policies /LIGHT-P1: Adverse effects of artificial lighting on the amenity and character of areas	Ellen Robotham	198.51	Oppose	<p>The chapter needs to appropriately reflect the risk of poorly managed lighting on aircraft safety. Civil Aviation regulations largely govern lighting requirements within the aircraft operational areas of Hawke’s Bay Airport. Beyond these areas, both within the Airport Zone and beyond, poorly managed lighting can pose a significant safety risk to aircraft on approach and take off.</p> <p>As currently drafted, the objectives within the Light chapter focus on operational and functional purposes, security, safety and amenity. Subsequent policies, rules and methods make either tacit or explicit reference to the potential effects of lighting on aircraft, as well as the effects of aircraft lighting.</p> <p>As drafted, insufficient recognition is afforded to the potential effects of lighting on aircraft safety and a disconnect exists between the objectives, policies and methods. The objectives do not recognise the potential effect of poorly managed lighting on aircraft operations. The policies and standards seek to avoid adverse effects of lighting on the safety of aircraft, however it is unclear which objective such provisions are giving effect to. The matters of discretion (which apply when a standard is breached) do not include consideration of aircraft safety effects, despite being included as a standard, nor do the assessment criteria applying to discretionary activities.</p> <p>There are significant gaps within the lighting framework as it relates to the potentially adverse effect on aircraft operations and safety and seeks that the Light chapter be reworked to address the matters raised above. The relevance of policies and rules that seek to enable lighting vehicles, trains and aircraft and considers this is best left to the relevant legislation that governs</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>LIGHT-P1: Adverse effects of artificial lighting on <u>aircraft safety and</u> the amenity and character of areas</p> <p>Allow an appropriate level of artificial lighting for operational and functional purposes while maintaining <u>aircraft safety and</u> the predominant character and amenity of each zone.</p>	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light /Policies /LIGHT-P2: Adverse effects of artificial lighting	Ellen Robotham	198.52	Oppose	<p>The chapter needs to appropriately reflect the risk of poorly managed lighting on aircraft safety. Civil Aviation regulations largely govern lighting requirements within the aircraft operational areas of Hawke’s Bay Airport. Beyond these areas, both within the Airport Zone and beyond, poorly managed lighting can pose a significant safety risk to aircraft on approach and take off.</p> <p>As currently drafted, the objectives within the Light chapter focus on operational and functional purposes, security, safety and amenity. Subsequent policies, rules and methods make either tacit or explicit reference to the potential effects of lighting on aircraft, as well as the effects of aircraft lighting.</p> <p>As drafted, insufficient recognition is afforded to the potential effects of lighting on aircraft safety and a disconnect exists between the objectives, policies and methods. The objectives do not recognise the potential effect of poorly managed lighting on aircraft operations. The policies and standards seek to avoid adverse effects of lighting on the safety of aircraft, however it is unclear which objective such provisions are giving effect to. The matters of discretion (which apply when a standard is breached) do not include consideration of aircraft safety effects, despite being included as a standard, nor do the assessment criteria applying to discretionary activities.</p> <p>There are significant gaps within the lighting framework as it relates to the potentially adverse effect on aircraft operations and safety and seeks that the Light chapter be reworked to address the matters raised above. The relevance of policies and rules that seek to enable lighting vehicles, trains and aircraft and considers this is best left to the relevant legislation that governs</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>LIGHT-P2: Adverse effects of artificial lighting</p> <p>Artificial lighting is located, designed, and operated to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) avoid light spill and glare creating a nuisance in residential and open space zones;</li> <li>b) control the maximum level of light overspill;</li> <li>c) manage adverse light spill effects on adjacent properties to ensure that the health and safety of people and views of the night sky are not reduced, and</li> <li>d) avoid adverse effects on the safety of the transport network, <u>including aircraft</u>.</li> </ul>	Open Submission



Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LIGHT - Light /Policies /LIGHT-P3: Appropriate lighting activities	Ellen Robotham	198.53	Oppose	<p>The chapter needs to appropriately reflect the risk of poorly managed lighting on aircraft safety. Civil Aviation regulations largely govern lighting requirements within the aircraft operational areas of Hawke’s Bay Airport. Beyond these areas, both within the Airport Zone and beyond, poorly managed lighting can pose a significant safety risk to aircraft on approach and take off.</p> <p>As currently drafted, the objectives within the Light chapter focus on operational and functional purposes, security, safety and amenity. Subsequent policies, rules and methods make either tacit or explicit reference to the potential effects of lighting on aircraft, as well as the effects of aircraft lighting.</p> <p>As drafted, insufficient recognition is afforded to the potential effects of lighting on aircraft safety and a disconnect exists between the objectives, policies and methods. The objectives do not recognise the potential effect of poorly managed lighting on aircraft operations. The policies and standards seek to avoid adverse effects of lighting on the safety of aircraft, however it is unclear which objective such provisions are giving effect to. The matters of discretion (which apply when a standard is breached) do not include consideration of aircraft safety effects, despite being included as a standard, nor do the assessment criteria applying to discretionary activities.</p> <p>There are significant gaps within the lighting framework as it relates to the potentially adverse effect on aircraft operations and safety and seeks that the Light chapter be reworked to address the matters raised above. The relevance of policies and rules that seek to enable lighting vehicles, trains and aircraft and considers this is best left to the relevant legislation that governs</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>LIGHT-P3: Appropriate lighting activities</p> <p>Recognise the positive effects of lighting for the safety of the community by enabling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) traffic signals and navigation aids;</li> <li>b) <del>lights of vehicles, trains and aircraft,</del> and</li> <li>c) temporary lighting for the purposes of emergency response.</li> </ul>	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light /LIGHT - Light - Rules Table	Ellen Robotham	198.54	Oppose	<p>The chapter needs to appropriately reflect the risk of poorly managed lighting on aircraft safety. Civil Aviation regulations largely govern lighting requirements within the aircraft operational areas of Hawke’s Bay Airport. Beyond these areas, both within the Airport Zone and beyond, poorly managed lighting can pose a significant safety risk to aircraft on approach and take off.</p> <p>As currently drafted, the objectives within the Light chapter focus on operational and functional purposes, security, safety and amenity. Subsequent policies, rules and methods make either tacit or explicit reference to the potential effects of lighting on aircraft, as well as the effects of aircraft lighting.</p> <p>As drafted, insufficient recognition is afforded to the potential effects of lighting on aircraft safety and a disconnect exists between the objectives, policies and methods. The objectives do not recognise the potential effect of poorly managed lighting on aircraft operations. The policies and standards seek to avoid adverse effects of lighting on the safety of aircraft, however it is unclear which objective such provisions are giving effect to. The matters of discretion (which apply when a standard is breached) do not include consideration of aircraft safety effects, despite being included as a standard, nor do the assessment criteria applying to discretionary activities.</p> <p>There are significant gaps within the lighting framework as it relates to the potentially adverse effect on aircraft operations and safety and seeks that the Light chapter be reworked to address the matters raised above. The relevance of policies and rules that seek to enable lighting vehicles, trains and aircraft and considers this is best left to the relevant legislation that governs</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>LIGHT-R2: Traffic signals and navigation aids; <del>lights of vehicles, trains and aircraft,</del> and temporary lighting for the purposes of emergency response.</p>	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light /Issues /LIGHT-I2: Appropriate lighting activities	Grant Russell	202.19	Support	<p>Considers Light - Issues - Light-I2: Appropriate lighting activities is appropriate given navigation aids are a requirement for maritime safety and for the functional and operation needs of the Port.</p>	<p>Retain Light - Issues - Light-I2: Appropriate lighting activities that notes the positive effects on safety by providing navigational aids as notified.</p>	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light /Objectives /LIGHT-O1: Appropriate lighting activities	Grant Russell	202.20	Support	<p>Considers Light - Objectives - Light-O1: Appropriate lighting activities is appropriate given Napier Port requires artificial lighting for operational and functional purposes so this objective is supported and should be retained.</p>	<p>Retain Light - Objectives - Light-O1: Appropriate lighting activities in its entirety.</p>	Open Submission

# LIGHT - Light

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LIGHT - Light /Policies /LIGHT-P3: Appropriate lighting activities	Grant Russell	202.21	Support	Considers Light-P3: Appropriate lighting activities Policy is appropriate given navigation aids are a requirement for maritime safety and for the functional and operational needs of the Port.	Retain Light-P3: Appropriate lighting activities that notes the positive effects on safety by providing navigational aids as was notified.	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light /LIGHT - Light - Rules Table	Grant Russell	202.22	Support	Considers Light - Light-R2: Traffic signals and navigation aids; lights of vehicles, trains and aircraft; and temporary lighting for the purposes of emergency response is supported given navigation aids are a requirement for maritime safety and for the functional and operation needs of the Port.	Retain Light - Light-R2: Traffic signals and navigation aids; lights of vehicles, trains and aircraft; and temporary lighting for the purposes of emergency response as a Permitted Activity as per notification.	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light/LIGHT - Light - Standards Table	Grant Russell	202.23	Amend	Considers Light-S1: Light spill and lighting design Standard Matters of discretion from the Operative Plan to be preferable to that as notified in that it includes health and safety requirements.	Amend Light-S1: Light spill and lighting design Standard Matters of discretion as follows:  Matters of discretion are: 1. Effects on residential amenity <del>and road safety and the extent to which these can be mitigated</del> , and 2. Design, location, and external appearance <del>of the artificial lighting, including the support structure(s), and</del> 3. <u>The effects on traffic safety</u> 4. <u>The positive effects on pedestrian safety</u> 5. <u>The effects on the health, safety and wellbeing of people.</u>	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light/LIGHT - Light - Standards Table	Grant Russell	202.24	Oppose	Opposes as Napier Port may require a light support structure greater than 25 metres in the General Industrial Zone and therefore discretion on this maximum is sought.	Delete All Industrial Zones 25m height limit in Light-S3 Table 1: Maximum height of light support structures in a zone as Napier Port may require a light support structure greater than 25 metres in the General Industrial Zone.	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light/LIGHT - Light - Standards Table	Grant Russell	202.25	Support	Supports the "No height limit" in the Port Zone for Light-S3 Table 1: Maximum height of light support structures in a zone.	Retain the "No height limit" in the Port Zone for Light-S3 Table 1: Maximum height of light support structures in a zone as notified.	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light /Assessment criteria	Grant Russell	202.26	Amend	Considers LIGHT-AC1: All activity infringements General should clarify b. any unique characteristics of the site.	Amend LIGHT-AC1: All activity infringements General to clarify b. any unique characteristics of the site as Napier Port supports any reference to the need for artificial lighting as a necessity for operational and / or functional requirements.	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light /LIGHT - Light - Rules Table	Amelia Longley	222.133	Support	Support rules that provide for outdoor lighting.	Retain LIGHT-R1.	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light/LIGHT - Light - Standards Table	Amelia Longley	222.134	Support	Support rules that provide for Outdoor lighting.	Retain LIGHT-S1.	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light/LIGHT - Light - Standards Table	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.31	Amend	Supports the control of light spill hours of 10pm to 7am and the overall light spill and lighting design standards. Amend provision LIGHT-S1 to read 'habitable room' rather than habitable space to allow for consistency in the plan.	Amend to:  <b>Light spill and lighting design</b>  All Residential Zones and all Open Space, Sports Parks, and Conservation Zones (except for McLean Park Sports Stadium)  1. Light spill conditions for all land uses other than for the purposes of illuminating a road:  c. between the hours of 10.00 p.m. and 7.00 a.m. the following day, any outdoor lighting must not cause an added illuminance in excess of 10 lux, measured horizontally or vertically as an average (at any window of a habitable <del>space</del> <u>room</u> within a building located on any other site), and d. outdoor lighting ....	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light /Objectives /LIGHT-O1: Appropriate lighting activities	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.71	Support	Supports Objective LIGHT-O1: Appropriate lighting activities as artificial lighting is necessary for the reasons identified in this objective, including at industrial sites such as Ravensdown's Napier Works which operates 24-hours a day. For this reason, this objective is supported.	Retain Objective LIGHT-O1 as notified.	Open Submission

# LIGHT - Light

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LIGHT - Light /Objectives /LIGHT-O2: Adverse effects of artificial lighting on the amenity and character of areas	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.72	Support	Supports Light-O2: Adverse effects of artificial lighting on the amenity and character of areas as it is agreed that it is also important that lighting is located, designed and maintained so it does not detract from character and amenity values. For this reason, this objective is supported.	Retain Objective LIGHT-O2 as notified.	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light /Policies /LIGHT-P1: Adverse effects of artificial lighting on the amenity and character of areas	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.73	Amend	Considers that Policy Light-P1: Adverse effects of artificial lighting on the amenity and character of areas should be amended as the policy only refers to lighting needed for operational and functional needs and does not refer to security and safety lighting. Therefore, amendments to the policy are requested to provide for consistency with Objective LIGHT-O1. In addition, allowing for security and safety lighting is important to Ravensdown given that it is required to provide such lighting at its sites.	Amend Policy LIGHT-P1 as follows:  Allow an appropriate level of artificial lighting for operational, <del>and</del> functional, <u>security and safety</u> purposes while maintaining the predominant character and amenity of each zone.	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light /Policies /LIGHT-P2: Adverse effects of artificial lighting	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.74	Support	Supports Policy Light-P2: Adverse effects of artificial lighting as it is considered that the mechanisms identified within this policy reflect the matters to be considered when setting appropriate regulatory controls for artificial lighting.	Retain Policy LIGHT-P2 as notified.	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light /LIGHT - Light - Rules Table	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.75	Support	Supports Light - Rules Table LIGHT-R1: Outdoor lighting as Rule LIGHT-R1A permits artificial lighting provided Standards LIGHT-S1, LIGHT-S2 and Table 1 are complied with, and any support structures comply with yard and height in relation to boundary requirements. Where the requirements of Rule LIGHT-R1A are not complied with, a restricted discretionary land use consent is required (Rule LIGHT-R1B).  Subject to the amendments requested to the LIGHT standards below, providing for artificial lighting, as proposed within this rule, is considered appropriate.  Restricted discretionary activity is also appropriate in circumstances where the conditions of the permitted activity rule are not complied with.	Retain Rule LIGHT-R1 as notified.	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light/LIGHT - Light - Standards Table	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.76	Amend	Considers that Light - Standards Table LIGHT-S1: Light spill and lighting design should be amended as this Standard outlines the light spill requirements for all land use in the city, except where the lighting is for the purpose of illuminating the road. Based on Ravensdown's understanding, these standards seem to reflect standard practice and therefore are generally supported. However, it is considered that an exception, similar to that provided for in relation to illumination of roads, may also be required to accommodate lighting required for health and safety purposes (e.g., warning lights required on tall structures for aircraft safety purposes).	Amend Standard LIGHT-S1 as follows:  1 Light spill conditions for all land uses other than for the purposes of illuminating a road <u>and to meet health and safety requirements:</u> ...	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light /LIGHT - Light - Standards Table	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.77	Oppose	Opposes Light-S3 Table 1: Maximum height of light support structures in a zone as Standard LIGHT-S2 requires light support structures to comply with the maximum heights in Table 1 (Condition (1)), while Condition (2) requires support structures to not exceed the Airport Height Control Designation. Table 1 then identifies that the maximum height for such structures in all industrial zones and precincts is 25m.  The 25m maximum height limit for light support structures in the GIZ is not supported by Ravensdown as it does not reflect the fact that in the GIZ there is no maximum height limit, except in the Ahuriri GIZ where the height limit is 24m. Light structure height limits should not be inconsistent with the zone height limits in Industrial zones.	Amend LIGHT-S3 Table 1: Maximum height of light support structures in a zone as follows: ... All Industrial Zones and Precincts – Must not exceed <del>25 in-</del> <u>height the zone or precincts' maximum height limits, and no height limit applies when no maximum height applies in the zone or precinct</u>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LIGHT - Light/LIGHT - Light - Standards Table	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.78	Oppose	<p>Opposes Light-S3: Table 1: Maximum height of light support structures in a zone as Standard LIGHT-S2 requires light support structures to comply with the maximum heights in Table 1 (Condition (1)), while Condition (2) requires support structures to not exceed the Airport Height Control Designation. Table 1 then identifies that the maximum height for such structures in all industrial zones and precincts is 25m.</p> <p>The 25m maximum height limit for light support structures in the GIZ is not supported by Ravensdown as it does not reflect the fact that in the GIZ there is no maximum height limit, except in the Ahuriri GIZ where the height limit is 24m. Light structure height limits should not be inconsistent with the zone height limits in industrial zones.</p>	<p>Amend LIGHT-S3 Table 1: Maximum height of light support structures in a zone as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>All Industrial Zones and Precincts – Must not exceed <del>25m</del> height the zone or precincts' maximum height limits, and no height limit applies when no maximum height applies in the zone or precinct.</p>	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light /LIGHT - Light /General	Trevor Ellis	253.45	Amend	<p>The submitter considers that Long-tailed bats (Threatened – Nationally Critical) are adversely affected by artificial lighting.</p> <p>Considers that to protect indigenous biodiversity so that there is no net loss as required by the NPS-IB, the lighting chapter should include objectives, policies, and rules that enable their protection.</p>	Seeks to amend the LIGHT chapter to include a requirement to avoid adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity.	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light/Policies / LIGHT-P2: Adverse effects of artificial lighting	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.77	Support	Supports the recognition of the adverse effects of artificial lighting in subclause d. Considers the 'avoid' directive sets strong directive to manage effects of artificial lighting on the transport network.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light /LIGHT - Light - Rules Table	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.78	Amend	Seeks an additional matter of discretion is included to ensure adverse effects of outdoor lighting account for potential adverse effects of the safety and efficiency of the transport network.	Add the following matter of discretion: <u>...3. Effects on the safety of road users and the state highway network.</u>	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light/LIGHT - Light - Standards	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.79	Amend	Seeks to amend sub-clause 1.b (All Residential Zones and all Open Space, Sports Parks, and Conservation Zones) and 1.c (All Commercial, Industrial, and Rural Zones and Precincts and Stadium Zone) to ensure adverse effects resulting from lighting are appropriate managed. Considers that the threshold for glare effects not causing a 'significant' adverse effect is too high and inconsistent with LIGHT-P2.	Amend LIGHT-S1 as follows: b/c. outdoor lighting must be selected, located, aimed, adjusted, screened, and maintained to ensure that glare resulting from the lighting does <del>not cause</del> <del>significant</del> avoid adverse effects on the occupants of residential activities, road users, or aircraft.	Open Submission
LIGHT - Light /LIGHT - Light - Standards Table	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.80	Amend	Seek to add 'effects on road safety and the extent to which these can be mitigated' as a matter of discretion, to ensure adverse glare effects on the safety and efficiency of the transport network are appropriately considered.	Add the following matter of discretion: <u>Effects on safety and efficiency of the state highway network and the extent to which these can be mitigated</u>	Open Submission

# NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Julie Chambers	53.2	Oppose	Opposes PDP Noise Standards Table S1: General noise limits being greater for nighttime than daytime.	No specific relief sought. Inferred decision requested to amend Noise Standards Table S1: General Noise Limits so that the noise levels at night are not more permissive than during the daytime.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /General	Tony Michelle	73.11	Amend	Considers the importance of recognising the functional importance of noise-generating activities whilst balancing the health and wellbeing of people and communities.	Amend the Noise Section to include the following Objective:  <u>The benefits of activities that generate noise are recognised, where the adverse effects from noise are compatible with the anticipated purpose, character, and amenity values of the relevant zone(s) and do not compromise public health, safety, and wellbeing of people and communities.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O3: Reverse sensitivity	Tony Michelle	73.12	Support	Supports Noise-O3: Reverse sensitivity as an important part of protecting existing and authorised activities.	Retain Noise-O3: Reverse sensitivity as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /General	Tony Michelle	73.13	Amend	Seeks to include a Policy for rural activities where they may have a functional / operational need that supports primary production including agricultural aviation.	Amend the Noise Section by including the following Policy:  <u>The use of noisy equipment that has a limited duration and frequency (in particular, audible bird scaring devices, agricultural aviation and frost protection devices, and harvesters) that supports primary production in the rural environment is enabled by exempting these activities from noise limits, subject to reasonable use.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general)	Tony Michelle	73.14	Amend	Seeks to have agricultural aviation provided for as a permitted activity in the plan.	Amend Noise-R1A as follows:  2. The noise and vibration standards in any part of the District Plan do not apply to the following, unless the District Plan specifically states otherwise. The activities listed below are therefore considered permitted activities in terms of the noise standards:  a. <u>agricultural aviation activity</u> , the noise from the use of vehicles, mobile machinery, or other mobile or portable equipment where they are used on a seasonal or intermittent basis for agricultural, horticultural, viticultural, or forestry activities that are permitted by the Plan;	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R3: Noise generated from helicopter landing areas	Tony Michelle	73.15	Oppose	Considers that clarification is required that helicopters undertaking agricultural activities are provided for in Noise-R1: Noise generation (general) 2. a.	Seeks that Noise-R3: Noise generated from helicopter landing areas is amended by including the following:  Note:  <u>3. Helicopters undertaking agricultural aviation activities are provided for in NOISE- R1 2) a)</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Glen McLeod Anne McLeod	74.2	Oppose	Zone Residential Zones 7a.m. to 7p.m. LAeq (15min) - 50 dB 7p.m. to 10pm LAeq(15min) - 45 dB 10p.m. to 7a.m. the following day LAeq(15min) - 40 dB <b>10p.m. to 7a.m. the following day LAFmax - 70 dB</b>  According to the experts regarding 70 decibels all night and the impact – “extended exposure to above 55-60 dB becomes annoying and ultimately disturbing”. This is a reasonably peaceful area, and we want to keep it that way.	no relief sought.	Open Submission

# NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Rick Neil Jamieson	77.5	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Peddie Street, Taradale, Greenmeadows will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, sense of community, existing (No. 37) Peddie Street property value and result in commercial building typologies. Noise-S1: General noise limits Standard is inconsistent with MRZ and HRZ intensification that will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increases in noise, street parking and vehicle movement.	Seeks that Peddie Street, Taradale, Greenmeadows are exempt from intensification in the MRZ and HRZ as notified.(Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Odette Charlotte Potgieter Henry George Potgieter	90.5	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, existing No. 40A Peddie Street property value and result in commercial building typologies. Noise-S1: General noise limits Standard is inconsistent with MRZ and HRZ intensification resultant lack of carparking and 1.5m front yard setbacks that will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with noise, street parking, vehicle movement, congestion, exacerbating infrastructure deficits and loss of greenspace in road reserves and properties.	Seeks that Peddie Street and Taradale are exempt from intensification in the MRZ and HRZ as notified.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Rosemary Anne Kirby Gregory John Kirby	91.4	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, existing Peddie Street property depreciation and result in commercial building typologies. Noise-S1: General noise limits Standard is inconsistent with MRZ and HRZ intensification resultant lack of carparking and 1.5m front yard setbacks that will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with noise, street parking, vehicle movement, congestion, exacerbating infrastructure deficits and loss of greenspace in road reserves and properties.	Seeks consultation with residents and that Peddie Street and Taradale are exempt from intensification in the MRZ and HRZ as notified.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Ross Dobbie Eileen Dobbie	92.5	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale, Greenmeadows will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, Peddie Street property depreciation and result in commercial building typologies. Noise-S1: General noise limits Standard is inconsistent with MRZ and HRZ intensification and will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increased noise, street parking shortages and vehicle movement congestion.	Seeks consultation with affected residents and that Peddie Street, Taradale and Greenmeadows are deleted from MRZ and HRZ provisions as notified.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Ross Dobbie Eileen Dobbie	93.5	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale, Greenmeadows will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, Peddie Street property depreciation and result in commercial building typologies. Noise-S1: General noise limits Standard is inconsistent with MRZ and HRZ intensification and will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increased noise, street parking shortages and vehicle movement congestion.	Seeks consultation with affected residents and that Peddie Street, Taradale, Greenmeadows are deleted from MRZ and HRZ provisions as notified.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Jean Ferguson	94.4	Oppose	Considers the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) in Winifred Street and around Napier South will result in a loss of neighbourhood sunlight and privacy. Noise-S1: General noise limits Standard is inconsistent with HRZ apartment buildings intensification.	Seeks that HRZ is deleted and the existing 1-2 storey building height control is retained in order to adequately control the adverse effects that would result from higher density development.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S3: General noise limits within the Port Zone	Kay Foley	97.1	Oppose	Notes that the Port faces increasing noise complaints despite its monitoring showing noise levels below 65dB, attributing the discrepancy to liberal averaging provisions in the existing Operative District Plan. Acknowledges the economic importance of the Port but seek fair mitigation measures for houses severely impacted by noise pollution. Considers, as per the Styles Group Port Noise Review (2022), that all dwellings exposed to 55dB or greater should be acoustically treated to achieve an indoor noise level of 40dB; adjusted mitigation budget is inadequate and progress too slow; and the number of affected dwellings is likely to increase to 51 (from 37) by 2035. Refer to original submission for full details	Amend Noise-S3: General noise limits Standard within the Port Zone to reference the need for improved/increased annual investment to reduce noise at source or for the Port to provide inflation CPI adjusted/increased acoustic mitigation to noise-affected properties. (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Cameron David Marett	98.7	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, Peddie Street property depreciation and result in commercial building typologies. Noise-S1: General noise limits Standard is inconsistent with MRZ and HRZ intensification and will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increased noise to 70dB all night due to street parking shortages and vehicle movement congestion.	Delete MRZ and HRZ in Peddie Street and Taradale in its entirety.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Lynette Harris	106.5	Amend	Submitter objects to the proposed changes in the PDP. Submitter was born in Napier and has lived on Peddie Street for many years, is a pensioner who has made alterations to their home and enjoys living in the quiet peaceful and safe area. Objects to, 19.5m high apartment blocks being built in Taradale and Greenmeadows, 12m high apartment blocks being built in Taradale and Greenmeadows, Commercial buildings being built in Taradale and Greenmeadows, No allowance for off street parking, Reduced privacy and sunlight, Increased vehicle movement, Increased noise to 70db all night; and The loss of neighbourhood character. Submitter is stressed about their future and believes it is unnecessary as vacant land exists in Napier.	Relief Sought is not included, however it is inferred that the submitter seeks the area around Peddie Street to be rezoned General Residential (not HRZ).	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Lilian Sandra Winnie	107.10	Oppose	Opposes noise limits of 70db at night in residential zones.	No specific relief sought. Seeks amendment to reduce night noise limits in residential zones [inferred].	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Cameron David Marett	111.5	Oppose	Opposes noise limits of 70db at night in residential zones.	No specific relief sought. Seeks amendment to reduce night noise limits in residential zones [inferred].	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Shirley Rosina Carrington	121.6	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Peddie Street and Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, devaluing of Peddie Street property values and result in commercial building typologies. Noise-S1: General noise limits Standard is inconsistent with MRZ and HRZ intensification that will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increases in noise to 70dB all night, street parking and vehicle movement.	Seeks that Peddie Street and Taradale are exempt from intensification in the HRZ and MRZ as notified.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing	Edward Robert Woolman	122.2	Oppose	Considers the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) and MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Elbourne Street and around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, trees, sunlight, privacy, greenspace, birdlife and sense of community. Objective Noise-O1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing is inconsistent with the social mental and physical impacts upon residents (many of whom are pensioners) arising from an unreasonable standard of amenity due to the proposed intensification with increased noise arising from increased density, population, congestion and people movements.	Delete MRZ and HRZ provisions from Elbourne Street and around Taradale.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing	Sandra Esther Wilson	129.4	Amend	Amend High Density Residential (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential (MRZ) for Taradale, particularly Elbourne Street. Submitter is opposed due to social impacts, on both health and well-being of residents. Considers impacts on noise, traffic, loss of green spaces, birdlife, character, sunlight, privacy, community, parking, anti-social behaviour, wind issues and the value of properties.  HRZ and MRZ will impact health and wellbeing of residents by increased levels of noise and activity.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Kim Hunter	130.5	Oppose	Considers the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) at 9A Peddie Street, Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, outlook, anticipatory decreased house values and a lack of personal safety. Noise-S1: General noise limits Standard is inconsistent with MRZ and HRZ intensification that will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increases in noise, street parking and vehicle movement. The submission process should also be extended and simplified.	Delete HRZ and MRZ in their entirety from existing neighbourhoods and reconsider greenfield development locations with appropriate infrastructure.	Open Submission

# NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Deborah and Dennis Dinneen	133.5	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) at 79 McDonald Street, Napier South will result in a loss of neighbourhood character. Noise-S1: General noise limits Standard is inconsistent with MRZ intensification that will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increases in noise, street parking, vehicle movement and possibly anti-social behaviour.	Delete MRZ and incompatible provisions (including Noise-S1: General noise limits Standard) from McDonald Street, Napier South.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /General	Jimmy Guerin	134.11	Amend	Considers that a new Objective should be added to better recognise the functional importance of noise generating activities.	Amend the Noise Section by including the following Objective:  <u>The benefits of activities that generate noise are recognised, where the adverse effects from noise are compatible with the anticipated purpose, character, and amenity values of the relevant zone(s) and do not compromise public health, safety, and wellbeing of people and communities.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O3: Reverse sensitivity	Jimmy Guerin	134.12	Support	Supports Noise-O3: Reverse sensitivity as an important part of protecting existing and authorised activities.	Retain Noise-O3: Reverse sensitivity as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /General	Jimmy Guerin	134.13	Amend	The submitter seeks to amend the Noise Section to include a Policy for rural activities where they may have a functional / operational need that supports primary production including agricultural aviation.	Amend the Noise Section by including the following Policy:  <u>The use of noisy equipment that has a limited duration and frequency (in particular, audible bird scaring devices, agricultural aviation and frost protection devices, and harvesters) that supports primary production in the rural environment is enabled by exempting these activities from noise limits, subject to reasonable use.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general)	Jimmy Guerin	134.14	Amend	Seeks to amend Noise-R1: Noise generation (general). Noise-R1A to enable the establishment of agricultural aviation as a Permitted Activity.	Amend Noise-R1A as follows:  2. The noise and vibration standards in any part of the District Plan do not apply to the following, unless the District Plan specifically states otherwise. The activities listed below are therefore considered permitted activities in terms of the noise standards:  a. the noise from the use of vehicles, mobile machinery, <u>agricultural aviation activity</u> , or other mobile or portable equipment where they are used on a seasonal or intermittent basis for agricultural, horticultural, viticultural, or forestry activities that are permitted by the Plan;	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R3: Noise generated from helicopter landing areas	Jimmy Guerin	134.15	Oppose	The submitter opposes Noise-R3: Noise generated from helicopter landing areas and considers that clarification is required that helicopters undertaking agricultural activities are provided for in Noise-R1: Noise generation (general) 2. a.	Seeks that Noise-R3: Noise generated from helicopter landing areas is amended by including the following:  Note:  1. Helicopter landing areas are also subject to the activity tables of the relevant zone, precinct and/or development area. Compliance with this rule does not protect any helicopter landing area from the lawful encroachment of noise-sensitive activities. 2. Rules must be in accordance with NZS 6807:1994 Noise 3. Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas - excluding 4.3 Averaging. <u>3. Helicopters undertaking agricultural aviation activities are provided for in NOISE-R1. 2. a.</u>	Open Submission



Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise / Introduction/	Sera Chambers	150.63	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment. Adjoining landowners should have the same rights to consultation and mitigation as landowners adjoining the port.	include mitigation requirements for HBAL to mitigate noise for affected landowners as per Port Noise Mitigation Requirements.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction	Sera Chambers	150.64	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment. Adjoining landowners should have the same rights to consultation and mitigation as landowners adjoining the port.	include mitigation requirements for HBAL to mitigate noise for affected landowners as per Port Noise Mitigation Requirements.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction	Sera Chambers	150.65	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment. Adjoining landowners should have the same rights to consultation and mitigation as landowners adjoining the port.	include mitigation requirements for HBAL to mitigate noise for affected landowners as per Port Noise Mitigation Requirements.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues	Sera Chambers	150.66	Amend	amend to include right to consultation and impact mitigation for adjoining landowners premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	amend to include right to consultation and impact mitigation for adjoining landowners premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues	Sera Chambers	150.67	Amend	amend to include right to consultation and impact mitigation for adjoining landowners premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	amend to include right to consultation and impact mitigation for adjoining landowners premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues	Sera Chambers	150.68	Amend	amend on the basis that existing adjoining landowners should have the same right to consultation and impact mitigations at the cost of the noise generators premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	amend on the basis that existing adjoining landowners should have the same right to consultation and impact mitigations at the cost of the noise generators premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues	Sera Chambers	150.69	Oppose	Oppose on the basis that existing adjoining landowners should have the same right to consultation and impact mitigations at the cost of the noise generators premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment e.g. the transport network (NCC/NZTA).	existing adjoining landowners who are impacted by increased road noise should have the same right to consultation and impact mitigation by the transport network in the same way that port noise is addressed.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues	Sera Chambers	150.70	Oppose	Oppose on the basis that existing adjoining landowners should have the same right to consultation and impact mitigations at the cost of the noise generators premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment e.g. HBAL. Adjoining landowners should have the same rights to consultation and mitigation as landowners adjoining the port.	include mitigation requirements for HBAL to mitigate noise for affected landowners as per Port Noise Mitigation Requirements.	Open Submission

# NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Introduction	Sera Chambers	150.119	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction	Sera Chambers	150.120	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction	Sera Chambers	150.121	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues	Sera Chambers	150.122	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues	Sera Chambers	150.123	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment. Noting the importance of amenity values to New Zealanders.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-13: Noise-sensitive activities can impact on the operation of noise-generating activities	Sera Chambers	150.124	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues	Sera Chambers	150.125	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment. "Generally consistent with relevant NZ Standard" is not sufficient protection.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission

# NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Objectives	Sera Chambers	150.126	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives	Sera Chambers	150.127	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies	Sera Chambers	150.128	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies	Sera Chambers	150.129	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects. Submitter notes that in other parts of NZ where an airport has increased its noise effect, consideration has been given to retrofitting acoustic insulation to existing houses depending on the noise levels.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R2A	Sera Chambers	150.130	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment e.g. construction company.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R3A	Sera Chambers	150.131	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment. Flight paths should be varied to ensure return flights are different paths.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R6A	Sera Chambers	150.132	Oppose	Oppose on the basis that existing adjoining landowners should have the same right to consultation and impact mitigations at the cost of the noise generators premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment e.g. the transport network (NCC/NZTA).	existing adjoining landowners who are impacted by increased road noise should have the same right to consultation and impact mitigation by the transport network in the same way that port noise is addressed.	Open Submission

# NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R8: Noise generated from temporary military training activities	Sera Chambers	150.133	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners particularly given the minimum distances listed. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for further information to be available on these activities in the same way that other temporary activities are managed and for land owners to be notified and have their say including the option to have the impacts mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment of the landowners property rights.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R10A	Sera Chambers	150.134	Oppose	Oppose on the basis that existing adjoining landowners should have the same right to consultation and impact mitigations at the cost of the noise generators premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment e.g. the transport network (NCC/NZTA).	existing adjoining landowners who are impacted by increased road noise should have the same right to consultation and impact mitigation by the transport network in the same way that port noise is addressed.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R14A	Sera Chambers	150.135	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R16A	Sera Chambers	150.136	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Sera Chambers	150.137	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects. Submitter notes that in other parts of NZ where an airport has increased its noise effect, consideration has been given to retrofitting acoustic insulation to existing houses depending on the noise levels.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /	Sera Chambers	150.138	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects. Submitter notes that in other parts of NZ where an airport has increased its noise effect, consideration has been given to retrofitting acoustic insulation to existing houses depending on the noise levels.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /Public health	Sera Chambers	150.139	Amend	amend on the basis that landowners should be consulted on changes to adjoining land with regard to noise and be able to have their say and allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks to add: <u>iv. consultation on "land" changes to adjoining "land" (including over airspace and any other changes to land e.g. construction, noise development) with adjoining property/landowners should be completed. The adjoining landowner should be notified and be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /Amenity values	Sera Chambers	150.140	Amend	amend on the basis that landowners should be consulted on changes to adjoining land with regard to noise and be able to have their say and allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks to add: <u>iv. consultation on "land" changes to adjoining "land" (including over airspace and any other changes to land e.g. construction, noise development) with adjoining property/landowners should be completed. The adjoining landowner should be notified and be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /NOISE-AC3: Noise generated from new or altered roads not meeting the activity standards (NOISE-R6)	Sera Chambers	150.141	Amend	Amend to allow adjoining landowners to have their say regarding options to mitigate noise effects to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle with the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment e.g. transport network – NCC/NZTA.	seeks for provision to be amended as follows: <u>a. the extent to which the road design adopts the best practicable option for enabling a safe and efficient transport network while adopting the best practicable option to mitigate noise effects on adjacent properties, in particular on noise-sensitive activities in conjunction with the adjoining landowner/s.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /	Sera Chambers	150.142	Amend	Considers the assessment criteria should be amended to allow adjoining landowners to have their say regarding options to mitigate noise effects in order to continue their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle with the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting upon their enjoyment e.g. transport network – NCC / NZTA.	Amend as follows: <u>a. whether the design, including location, methods, and construction techniques proposed, is likely to provide an internal noise environment that is likely to ensure that the internal noise levels are reasonable for the occupants and will avoid or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects on the transportation network, in particular on noise-sensitive activities in conjunction with adjoining landowner/s.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria	Sera Chambers	150.143	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting their enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects. Submitter notes that in other parts of NZ where an airport has increased its noise effect, consideration has been given to retrofitting acoustic insulation to existing houses depending upon the noise levels.	Seeks that adjoining landowners are notified and are able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and that there is the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity adversely affecting their enjoyment that includes compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications in order to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Introduction /General	James Witham	165.31	Amend	Considers that the introduction does not capture a number of key issues including environments where certain activities that can make noise are prioritised. In particular, land based primary production on Highly Productive Land as set out in the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. Associated with this is focussing on conflicts of uses and sensitivity effects in addition to reverse sensitivity effects. considers that the definition of 'reverse sensitivity' is narrow and only applies in circumstances where activities are established and more sensitive activities establish later. Notes that the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land directs priority to be given to land based primary production on Highly Productive Land, regardless of when it is established.	<p>Amend the Noise Introduction as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:</p> <p>The purpose of the Noise chapter is to appropriately manage noise from activities within Napier city and the potential for <u>reverse sensitivity and conflicts between land uses with different amenity requirements</u>. The provisions seek to achieve a balance between efficiently enabling activities anticipated in a relevant zone to occur while balancing these with achieving public health and amenity outcomes.</p> <p>The level and type of noise generated by activities can impact on the health and wellbeing of people in our urban areas, particularly when it affects sleep or the ability to work or learn. The provisions of the Noise chapter seek to ensure noise is appropriately managed at the source and the receiving environment. The provisions also seek to manage reverse sensitivity <u>and sensitivity effects arising from noise sensitive activities choosing to establish in close proximity to existing, lawfully established activities, or in environments where activities that may generate noise are prioritised over sensitive uses.</u></p> <p>.....</p> <p>To meet the strategic objectives for the District Plan, the noise provisions provide for the following:</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-I3: Noise-sensitive activities can impact on the operation of noise-generating activities	James Witham	165.32	Amend	Considers that , though the issue is generally supported, the definition of 'reverse sensitivity' is narrow and only applies in circumstances where activities are established and more sensitive activities establish later. Notes that the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land directs priority to be given to land based primary production on Highly Productive Land, regardless of when it is established.	<p>Amend NOISE-I3: Noise sensitive activities can impact the operation of noise generating activities as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:</p> <p>NOISE-I3: Noise sensitive activities can impact the operation of noise generating activities</p> <p>Where there is high noise generating activities and infrastructure it is not reasonable or practicable for the noise generators to internalise their noise effects. Therefore, surrounding land use needs to be managed to about the potential for reverse sensitivity <u>land use conflict</u>. Depending on the level of noise, activities sensitive to noise may need to be avoided or acoustically treated to insulate from external noises and prevent potential <del>reverse</del> sensitivity effects.</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing	James Witham	165.33	Support	Supports the objective insofar as the effects of noise should be managed according to the anticipated amenity requirements for the receiving environment.	Retain NOISE-O1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing as notified	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O3: Reverse sensitivity	James Witham	165.34	Amend	Considers that the term 'authorised' is ambiguous and unclear. Proposes that the inclusion of 'anticipated' in lieu of 'authorised' provides more certainty. Also considers that it would better reflect the outcomes sought by the objectives and polices of the relevant zones, particularly where certain uses are prioritised over others. Considers that the definition of 'reverse sensitivity' is narrow and only applies in circumstances where activities are established and more sensitive activities establish later. Notes that the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land directs priority to be given to land based primary production on Highly Productive Land, regardless of when it is established. Also notes that Objectives and Policies of the Proposed Napier District Plan supports primary production on Versatile Soils and the Rural Production Zone generally. Where sensitive activities are established and there is a change from one land based primary production activity to another, the term 'reverse sensitivity' does not apply, however, the effects of land based primary production should be prioritised and sensitivity issues managed.	Amend NOISE-O3 Reverse sensitivity as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:  NOISE-O3 Reverse Sensitivity <u>and conflicts between uses</u>  Existing and <del>authorised</del> <u>anticipated</u> activities that generate high levels of noise are protected from <del>reverse</del> sensitivity and <u>reverse sensitivity</u> effects	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing	James Witham	165.35	Amend	Supports the policy as it is appropriate generally, however, the onus should be on new and expanded residential areas to avoid and/or mitigate noise effects where new zone interfaces occur. Considers the protection of existing areas is appropriate and that the amendments proposed make the policy framework more consistent with Policy 2.	Amend NOISE-P1 Amenity values, health and wellbeing as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:  NOISE-P1 Amenity values, health and wellbeing  Maintain the anticipated amenity values of the zone and provide for the health and wellbeing of the community by:  a. controlling the noise effects throughout the city to meet the relevant objectives for the zone;  b. managing the interface of different zones to protect the amenity values of <u>existing</u> residential and other less noisy areas of the city, and  c. providing for higher levels of noise generation for education facilities during the day on weekdays and a limited number of temporary events where these activities contribute to community wellbeing and potential adverse effects on amenity values are minimised.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P2: Noise-sensitive activities	James Witham	165.36	Support	Supports policy as it would appropriately cover the Rural Production Zone and give effect to the avoidance of sensitivity effects/ conflicts of uses as set out in the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Retain NOISE-P2: Noise sensitive activities as notified	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P4: Reverse sensitivity	James Witham	165.37	Amend	<p>Considers the policy is not strong enough where development is always likely to be sensitive to its environment. Preventing this type of development must be a potential option. Considers that the policy does not give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land without further detailing necessary and required management actions in the rural zones of the District.</p> <p>Considers the definition of 'reverse sensitivity' is narrow and only applies in circumstances where activities are established and more sensitive activities establish later. Notes that the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land directs priority to be given to land based primary production on Highly Productive Land, regardless of when it is established. Also notes objectives and policies of the PNDP supports primary production on Versatile Soils and the Rural Production Zone generally. Where sensitive activities are established and there is a change from one land based primary production activity to another the term 'reverse sensitivity' does not apply. Considers that the effects of land based primary production should be prioritised and sensitivity issues managed.</p>	<p>Amend NOISE-P4: Reverse sensitivity as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:</p> <p>Noise-P4: Reverse sensitivity <u>and sensitivity to noise</u> Restrict <u>or avoid</u> development of noise-sensitive activities within:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Air Noise Boundary, and</li> <li>other locations where ventilation and acoustic insulation standards are not met <u>and</u></li> <li><u>zones where the character and amenity of the relevant zone favours land based primary production activities.</u></li> </ol>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /General	James Witham	165.38	Amend	<p>Considers that the proposed District Plan appropriately exempts or prioritises certain short term rural noise making activities but there is no policy support in the framework so where issues occur in terms of implementation there is a lack of guidance as to the management direction provided. Considers that the inclusion of a policy would give better effect to the implementation of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land</p>	<p>Insert new Policy NOISE-Pxx Temporary and short-term noise from primary production as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:</p> <p><u>Policy NOISE-Pxx Temporary and short-term noise from primary production</u></p> <p><u>Provide for and prioritise temporary and short term noise, including appropriate exemptions from quantitative noise standards, for primary production activities located on Highly Productive Land and Versatile Land/Rural Production Zone, including but not limited to the following activities:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>harvesting;</u></li> <li><u>haymaking</u></li> <li><u>frost protection</u></li> <li><u>bird scaring</u></li> <li><u>spraying</u></li> <li><u>use of fixed and mobile machinery</u></li> </ol>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general)	James Witham	165.39	Support	<p>Supports as it will assist in giving effect to avoiding sensitivity effects and conflicts of uses as directed by the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.</p>	<p>Retain NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general) as notified and grant all relief sought by submitter for this chapter.</p>	Open Submission



Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R5: Noise generated from rural production activities	James Witham	165.40	Amend	<p>Supports rule generally and notes that it appears to be similar to the rolled over provisions in the Hastings District Plan. Considers that substantial improvements in fan technology have occurred since that time in terms of noise levels and the removal of special acoustic characteristics as set out in section 6.3 of the New Zealand Standard 6802:2008 Acoustics – Environmental Noise through blade design and number of fan blades. Four blade fans can achieve 55dB LAeq(15 min) at 240 metres and five blade fans at 180m from the fans, and without special acoustic characteristics. Considers that with the limits proposed for the Proposed District Plan, contemporary fan performance, and also the matters set out in s.16 of the Resource Management Act outside and in addition to the Proposed District Plan, fans with special acoustic characteristics are unlikely to be acceptable.</p> <p>Considers that a performance standard to manage sensitivity effects would be more appropriate and provide more clarity</p>	<p>Amend NOISE-R5A: Noise generated from rural production activities as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:</p> <p>NOISE-R5A: Noise generated from rural production activities Frost <del>protection</del> fans</p> <p>12. Frost fans <del>shall</del> <u>must</u>:</p> <p>a. <u>have a minimum of 4 fan blades and not have special acoustic characteristics;</u></p> <p>b. <u>be located and operated such so</u> that noise from a frost fan shall not exceed 65dB LAeq(15 min) when measured outdoors at a distances that is the lesser of:</p> <p>c. <del>300 m from the device</del></p> <p>i. <del>at</del> any notional boundary (other than on the property on which the fan is situated) existing at the time the frost fan is established, or</p> <p>ii. <del>at</del> any point within a residential zone.</p> <p>Whichever is the lesser distance.</p> <p>13. Any new <u>or additions to a building for a</u> noise sensitive activity</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /General	James Witham	165.41	Amend	<p>Considers that the meaning and effect of the provision in NOISE-R5 13 is unclear. It is more appropriate, and provides more clarity, to specify a performance standard to manage sensitivity effects. The standards proposed appropriately avoid, or mitigate noise, sensitivity and reverse sensitivity effects and are adapted from similar provisions in the Proposed District Plan.</p>	<p>Insert new standard Noise Sx – Acoustic treatment for new and expanded sensitive activities within 300m of a frost fan as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:</p> <p><u>Noise Sx – Acoustic treatment for new and expanded sensitive activities within 300m of a frost fan</u></p> <p>1. <u>New buildings and alterations and additions to existing buildings within 300m of a frost fan containing a sensitive activity must be designed to achieve an indoor design sound level 40 DB LDN within any habitable rooms while the frost fan is in operation.</u></p> <p>2. <u>Compliance must be demonstrated with 1 above must be demonstrated by submitting an acoustic design report. The report must be:</u></p> <p>i. <u>Submitted to Council prior to construction</u></p> <p>ii. <u>Be prepared by a suitable qualified acoustic expert, and</u></p> <p>iii. <u>Certify that the proposed design and construction will achieve the indoor design sound levels</u></p> <p>3. <u>The building must be designed, constructed, and maintained in accordance with the acoustic design certification.</u></p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /NOISE-AC1: General assessment criteria for activities generating noise and/or vibration	James Witham	165.42	Support	<p>Supports proposed assessment criteria as appropriate.</p>	<p>Retain NOISE-AC: General assessment criteria for activities generation noise and/or vibration as notified.</p>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /NOISE-AC2: Noise generated from rural production activities not meeting the activity standards (NOISE-R5)	James Witham	165.43	Amend	Considers that the proposed assessment criteria appears to inappropriately give weight to non-primary production activities and does not give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. Additional matters of discretion are required to appropriately balance the priority of activities.	Amend NOISE-AC2: Noise Generated from rural production activities not meeting the activity standards (NOISE-R5) as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:  The following assessment criteria apply in addition to NOISE- AC1:  Rural Production  a. The extent to which productive rural activities can be activities can be undertaken while mitigating or managing noise effects on adjacent properties, in particular on noise sensitive activities.  <u>b. The priority of land based primary production activities on Highly Productive Land and Versatile Land.</u>  <u>c. The extent to which the design, construction and location of noise sensitive activities can avoid sensitivity effects.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction /	Sheena McGuire	168.93	Amend	Seeks the inclusion of a new Vibration Alert Area Overlay to identify areas susceptible to rail vibration, within 60m of the rail corridor boundary. Seeks the inclusion of an overview of this overlay and its purpose within the introduction section.	Amend as follows:  ...  The RMA empowers territorial authorities to regulate activities on land and water affecting amenity values but does not enable the authorities to control noise from overflying aircraft. Noise from overflying aircraft is controlled under section 29B of the Civil Aviation Act 1990.  The approach to noise management set out within this chapter is generally consistent with the NZ Standard.  <u>A Rail Vibration Alert Overlay has been applied which identifies the vibration-sensitive area within 60 metres each side of the railway designation boundary as properties within this area may experience rail vibration effects. No specific district plan provisions apply in relation to vibration controls as a result of this Rail Vibration Alert Area. The Rail Vibration Alert Overlay is to advise property owners of the potential vibration effects but leaves with the site owner to determine an appropriate response.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing	Sheena McGuire	168.94	Support	Supports that the health and wellbeing of people and communities should be protected from adverse noise levels.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O3: Reverse sensitivity	Sheena McGuire	168.95	Support	Supports the protection of existing and authorised activities, such as rail operations, from reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O4: Transport network	Sheena McGuire	168.96	Amend	Submitter continuously works to reduce existing sound exposure and to manage the effects of our operations on existing sensitive activities, however, due to the nature of rail operations, are unable to internalise all noise effects associated with rail activities. Seeks amendment to reflect this in this policy.	Amend as follows:  <del>The operators of transport corridors adopt the best practicable option to ensure noise levels are reasonable and seek to minimise the effects from transport noise on noise-sensitive activities, as far as reasonably practicable.</del>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P2: Noise-sensitive activities	Sheena McGuire	168.97	Support	Supports this policy which recognises the need to prevent noise-sensitive activities in certain locations and provide appropriate acoustic treatment to protect amenity. Also supports that the rail corridor is a high noise-generating which may be located in the residential zone.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P4: Reverse sensitivity	Sheena McGuire	168.98	Support	Supports restricting noise sensitive activities where ventilation and acoustic insulation standards cannot be met.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P5: Transport network	Sheena McGuire	168.99	Amend	Seeks amendment to this policy to recognise the functional and operational requirements of maintaining, operating, and improving the railway network.Considers that clause a. would impose an impractical restriction and narrow focus on the best practicable option for upgrades to and development of the rail network. Seeks to manage adverse noise effects of rail activities, however considers that this is just one in a range of considerations for the provision a safe and efficient transport network. Seeks for the deletion of clause a. to remove the narrow outcome for the delivery of a safe and efficient transport network. Seeks minor amendment to clause b. as management of noise sensitive activities includes treatments beyond noise insulation to ensure that an appropriate level of amenity is provided within buildings containing noise sensitive activities in proximity to the rail corridor.	Amend as follows:  Minimise potential conflicts between noise generated from the transport network and noise-sensitive activities by:  <del>a. requiring the adoption of the best practicable option to minimise the noise effects on all new and upgraded state highways, arterials, collector roads, and railways constructed in the city, and</del>  b. requiring <del>insulation treatment</del> of new or altered noise-sensitive activities where they are located <u>within</u> a High Land Transport Noise Overlay.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general)	Sheena McGuire	168.100	Amend	Seeks amendment to ensure that all rail operations are exempt/considered permitted activities in terms of noise standards. Clause e. needs to be broadened slightly to include all ancillary rail movements (hi-rail vehicles etc) and level crossing alarms.	Amend as follows:  1. For all activities other than those specifically addressed in NOISE-R2 – NOISE-R8 (inclusive), NOISE-S1 and NOISE-S2 apply.  2. The noise and vibration standards in any part of the District Plan do not apply to the following, unless the District Plan specifically states otherwise. The activities listed below are therefore considered permitted activities in terms of the noise standards:  a. the noise from the use of vehicles, mobile machinery, or other mobile or portable equipment where they are used on a seasonal or intermittent basis for agricultural, horticultural, viticultural, or forestry activities that are permitted by the Plan;  b. the noise from animals on farms unless they are confined within a building or enclosure on a permanent or semi- permanent basis. This does not apply to dog breeding, kennels, or dog-stay facilities;  c. the noise from normal residential activity that is part of a residential land use, such as children’s play, informal social activities, lawnmowing, and home maintenance work undertaken by the occupier, provided the activity is undertaken during	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R10: Noise sensitive activities in the High Land Transport Noise Overlay	Sheena McGuire	168.101	Amend	KiwiRail supports a rule aligning with their noise mitigation model provisions sought to be included in District Plans across New Zealand . Notes that rail operations run 24/7, and train characteristics can change without community consultation. Noise can have an impact on the internal amenity of a building. Mitigation measures are essential to prevent adverse effects on the health and wellbeing of nearby residents and workers. Seeks a new rule and standard to ensure appropriate internal amenity in buildings for sensitive activities. This is most effectively achieved at the time of construction. The further removed from the rail corridor a building is, the less additional mitigation may be required. Mitigation levels are based on World Health Organisation standards, considering intermittent train noise and community acceptance. Notes requiring a greater setback from the rail boundary as a means of addressing noise effects at smaller residential sites near the rail corridor may not be feasible. Non-compliance requires consent as a restricted discretionary activity under the proposed plan. Balancing efficient rail network use with community wellbeing and safety is crucial. KiwiRail and NZTA seek to protect the safe and efficient operation of their respective transport networks, and the amenity of those who reside and work within proximity to transport corridors. Both collaborate to produce a refined rule and standard to manage noise-sensitive activities within the High Land Transport Noise Overlay. Both seek the same framework of controls in terms of managing noise effects, with some variation in criteria and distances between road and rail. The purpose of the provisions sought is to protect the health of occupants of new and altered buildings, and in turn to avoid or mitigate potential reverse sensitivity effects on the operations of KiwiRail and NZTA.	Replace NOISE-R10 with the rule provided in Appendix A as below  <u>NOISE-R10: Noise sensitive activities in the High Land Transport Noise Overlay</u> <u>NOISE-R10A</u> <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>Any new buildings or alterations to existing buildings containing an activity sensitive to noise which complies with the noise standards in NOISE-S7.</u> <u>NOISE-R10B</u> <u>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>1. Whether the activity sensitive to noise could be located further from the state highway or railway network.</u> <u>2. The extent to which the noise criteria are achieved and the effects of any noncompliance.</u> <u>3. The character of, and degree of, amenity provided by the existing environment and proposed activity.</u> <u>4. The reverse sensitivity effects on the state highway or rail network, and the extent to which mitigation measures can enable their ongoing operation, maintenance and upgrade.</u> <u>5. The outcome of any consultation with Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency or KiwiRail.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /General	Sheena McGuire	168.102	Amend	KiwiRail supports a rule aligning with their noise mitigation model provisions sought to be included in District Plans across New Zealand . Notes that rail operations run 24/7, and train characteristics can change without community consultation. Noise can have an impact on the internal amenity of a building. Mitigation measures are essential to prevent adverse effects on the health and wellbeing of nearby residents and workers. Seeks a new rule and standard to ensure appropriate internal amenity in buildings for sensitive activities. This is most effectively achieved at the time of construction. The further removed from the rail corridor a building is, the less additional mitigation may be required. Mitigation levels are based on World Health Organisation standards, considering intermittent train noise and community acceptance. Notes requiring a greater setback from the rail boundary as a means of addressing noise effects at smaller residential sites near the rail corridor may not be feasible. Non-compliance requires consent as a restricted discretionary activity under the proposed plan. Balancing efficient rail network use with community wellbeing and safety is crucial. KiwiRail and NZTA seek to protect the safe and efficient operation of their respective transport networks, and the amenity of those who reside and work within proximity to transport corridors. Both collaborate to produce a refined rule and standard to manage noise-sensitive activities within the High Land Transport Noise Overlay. Both seek the same framework of controls in terms of managing noise effects, with some variation in criteria and distances between road and rail. The purpose of the provisions sought is to protect the health of occupants of new and altered buildings, and in turn to avoid or mitigate potential reverse sensitivity effects on the operations of KiwiRail and NZTA.	Add new standard provided in Appendix A as below  <u>NOISE-S7: Acoustic treatment for noise sensitive activities in the High Land Transport Noise Overlay</u> <u>Outdoor road noise</u> <u>1. Any new building, or alteration to an existing building, that contains an activity sensitive to noise where:</u> <u>a. external road noise levels are less than 57 dB LAeq(24h) at all points 1.5 metres above ground level within the proposed notional boundary; or</u> <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>1. Whether the activity sensitive to noise could be located further from the state highway or railway network.</u> <u>2. The extent to which the noise criteria are achieved and the effects of any noncompliance.</u> <u>3. The character of, and degree of, amenity provided by the existing environment and proposed activity.</u> <u>b. there is a noise barrier at least 3 metres high which blocks the line of sight to the road surface from all points 1.5 metres above ground level within the proposed notional boundary.</u> <u>Indoor road and railway noise</u> <u>2. Any new building, or alteration to an existing building, that contains an activity sensitive to noise where the building or alteration is:</u> <u>a. designed, constructed and maintained to achieve indoor design noise levels resulting from the road or railway not exceeding the maximum values in in Table-S7; or</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R7: Noise generated from temporary events	Cameron Drury	170.8	Amend	Considers that it would be advantageous to enable McLean Park and the Church Road concert venues to accommodate a limited number of performances that may be characterised by infrequent and minor increase of noise above the 85 dB LAeq (5 min) limit.	Amend by increasing the NOISE-R7 limit to 90 dB LAeq (5 min) for no more than 2 Temporary Events in Stadium Zone and on Section SO 9752.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O5: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport	Mark Leggett	180.9	Support	Supports the more specific wording of the proposed objective and policy (in comparison to the equivalent Operative District Plan provisions)	Retain provisions as notified.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P6: Port noise	Mark Leggett	180.10	Support	Supports the more specific wording of the proposed objective and policy (in comparison to the equivalent Operative District Plan provisions)	Retain provisions as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S5: Acoustic treatment for activities sensitive to aircraft noise inside the Outer Control Boundary	Simon Bradshaw	182.3	Amend	The standard as currently drafted would result in significant compliance costs for purchasers of sites in the eastern portion of Area 4 at Parklands. It is considered this is unnecessarily onerous and should not be extended to this existing residentially zoned area in principle. Alternative, to achieve an appropriate internal noise environment while enabling growth and operation of the Airport, alternative measures should be explored to reduce compliance costs, including an option to adopt standardised acoustic treatment measures that do not require a report from a "suitably qualified acoustic expert" and/or compensation by the Airport similar to the approach taken with the Port Noise overlay.	Remove the overlay from applying to the zoned land at Parklands.  Alternatively,  Review standard NOISE-S5 to reduce compliance costs on residential development.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction /	Alan Petersen	187.1	Amend	Considers Napier city's regionally significant infrastructure includes Hawke's Bay Airport and Napier Port. These activities are situated near residential zones and have operating requirements that make it impracticable for them to internalise their noise effects. Seeks to add the following to paragraph 4 for emphasis. For Port to "fully" internalise their noise effects.	Seeks to add the following to paragraph 4 for emphasis. For Port to "fully" internalise their noise effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction /	Alan Petersen	187.2	Amend	Acoustic treatment requirements for noise-sensitive activities in areas affected by <del>the</del> "port noise".	Seeks - Submission 2 - P2 - 3rd bullet point 'acoustic treatment requirements for noise-sensitive activities in areas affected by "port noise" '. Make it more specific to noise.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction /	Alan Petersen	187.3	Amend	limits on vibration generated by construction activities to protect buildings and to limit <b>disruption to people and businesses;</b> Submission 3 – P2 – last bullet point. Disruption to normal recreational rest and business activities. This should include for outdoor living space as defined in the Definitions Section including in PREC3 – the Napier Hill Mataruahou Amenity Precinct.  An outdoor living space "means an area of open space for the use of the occupants of the residential unit or units to which the space is allocated". In reality it is treated like an outside room for quiet and peacefulness not to be impacted by disturbance including adverse noise effects.	Submission 3 – P2 – last bullet point. Disruption to normal recreational rest and business activities. This should include for outdoor living space as defined in PREC3 – the Napier Hill Mataruahou Amenity Precinct.  An outdoor living space "means an area of open space for the use of the occupants of the residential unit or units to which the space is allocated". In reality it is treated like an outside room for quiet and peacefulness not to be impacted by disturbance including adverse noise effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-I2: Noise generation can detract from amenity values	Alan Petersen	187.4	Oppose	Submission 4 - P3 – NOISE I2 - The degree of quiet or peacefulness in an area contributes to the amenity values appreciated by its occupants. Noise from the Port means this is simply not achievable. It cannot be avoided and can only be mitigated to a certain extent and the allowable noise levels are still too high to meet the normal expectations of quiet and peacefulness in a residential area.	Submission 4 - P3 – NOISE I2 - The degree of quiet or peacefulness in an area contributes to the amenity values appreciated by its occupants. Noise from the Port means this is simply not achievable. It cannot be avoided and can only be mitigated to a certain extent and the allowable noise levels are still too high to meet the normal expectations of quiet and peacefulness in a residential area.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-I3: Noise-sensitive activities can impact on the operation of noise-generating activities	Alan Petersen	187.5	Amend	Submission 5 – P3 – Noise I3 - In the Port Noise Zones this is not reasonable or practicable.	Seeks to change "not reasonable" to "not possible".	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-I6: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport noise	Alan Petersen	187.6	Amend	Regionally significant infrastructure, such as Hawke's Bay Airport and Napier Port, <b>is</b> situated near residential zones and has operating requirements that prevent it from fully internalising its noise effects.	Seeks to amend, Submission 6 - P4 – NOISE - I6 - First line "is" should be "are".	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-I6: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport noise	Alan Petersen	187.7	Amend	Despite adopting all practicable options to internalise noise, the port may, at times, generate a level of noise outside its zone boundary that is greater than would otherwise be expected in adjacent zones. Residents overlooking or near to Napier Port should be aware that the level of effects may be higher than experienced in other residential areas of the city and in some cases at a level that would normally be incompatible with traditional residential activity. Special noise standards and a noise management plan are appropriate, permitting the port to operate while recognising and mitigating its adverse effects on nearby noise-sensitive activities.	Amend Submission 7 - Second paragraph – Add that it should be noted the noise sensitive activities, including the residential areas within the current noise boundaries, were largely in place before the Port was established in its current location.	Open Submission

# NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing	Alan Petersen	187.8	Amend	Submission 8 – P 5 - NOISE - O1 - Agreed. But this should include outdoor living spaces during the day and at night – especially in evenings.	Amend to include outdoor living spaces during the day and at night – especially in evenings.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O5: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport	Alan Petersen	187.9	Amend	Submission 9 – P5 - Noise – O5 – Agreed – but the Port Noise limits are too high and therefore fail to achieve this objective.	Submission 9 – P5 - Noise – O5 – Agreed – but the Port Noise limits are too high and therefore fail to achieve this objective.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P2: Noise-sensitive activities	Alan Petersen	187.10	Amend	Enable the functional operation of noise sensitive activities by: a. preventing noise sensitive activities from establishing in inappropriate locations; b. preventing high noise-generating activities other than roads and railway lines from establishing in residential zones, and c. where noise-sensitive activities establish in areas exposed to high noise-generating activities, require the acoustic treatment to achieve an appropriate internal noise level to enable uninterrupted sleep at night and an internal environment for uses that do not involve overnight accommodation that protects people from unreasonable noise.	Submission 10 – P5 - NOISE – P2 - c. This should also include outdoor living spaces during the day and at night – especially in the evenings. It's an interesting conundrum that residents that live there are expected to tolerate the noise, but visitors are not and therefore are not allowed to be accommodated!	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P6: Port noise	Alan Petersen	187.11	Amend	Submission 11 – P6 - NOISE P6 – Add d. If noise cannot be avoided or fully mitigated and breaches the levels for internal or outdoor living spaces, then the Port shall pay the affected persons with the Port Noise areas suitable compensation. This to be determined by a valuer & other experts to design a fair & reasonable formula. After all it is consistent with the polluter pays principal.  Refer attached report “Port Noise Proposals in the Napier District Plan Review” (the updated version 11/12/2023).	Add d. If noise cannot be avoided or fully mitigated and breaches the levels for internal or outdoor living spaces, then the Port shall pay the affected persons with the Port Noise areas suitable compensation. This to be determined by a valuer & other experts to design a fair & reasonable formula. After all it is consistent with the polluter pays principal.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration	Alan Petersen	187.12		Time Period Maximum noise levels LAeq (dB) 7.30 a.m. - 6.00 p.m. - 75 6.00 p.m. - 7.30 a.m. - <b>80</b>	Submission 12 – P8 - Noise R2A - point 3 - Why is noise between 6.00PM – 7.30am (i.e. night-time) at 80 LAeq (dB) and daytime is lower at 75. Correct this possible anomaly.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R12: New or altered noise sensitive activity within the Port Noise Overlay	Alan Petersen	187.13		<b>1. Aan</b> acoustic design report must be provided to the Council prior to any application for building consent or, where no building consent is required, prior to the commencement of the use. The acoustic design report must be prepared by a person qualified and experienced in acoustics. The report is to indicate the means by which the noise limits specified in this rule will be complied with and is to contain a certificate by its author that the means given therein will be adequate to ensure compliance with the noise limits specified in this rule.	Submission 13 - P20 – NOISE – R12A – point 3 – Typo – “Aan” should be “An”.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R12: New or altered noise sensitive activity within the Port Noise Overlay	Alan Petersen	187.14	Amend	Building Element - Wall Requirement - 1. 20 mm timber weather boards exterior cladding. Internal lining two layers of 10 mm thick gypsum plasterboard. Minimum 75 mm thick fibreglass or polyester or wool insulation in wall cavity. 2. Brick veneer. Internal lining 1 layer of 10 mm thick gypsum plasterboard.	Submission 14 - P21 – A physicist engineer who redeveloped the Farmers building in Auckland Hobson St into apartments found after much testing that having a party wall made of two panels with an 150mm airgap was the most effective way to prevent noise transmission from one side to the other. Therefore allow other methods.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R12: New or altered noise sensitive activity within the Port Noise Overlay	Alan Petersen	187.15	Oppose	Floor 1. On grade slab. 2. Two layers of 20 mm thick particle board	Submission 15 - P22 - 4. Add for other flooring systems that meet the insulation standards (that I have worked on). Don't just specify particle board – a very sub-standard product.	Open Submission

# NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S3: General noise limits within the Port Zone	Alan Petersen	187.16	Oppose	<p>Submission 16 - P29 &amp; 30 – NOISE – S3: General noise limits within the Port Zone &amp; S4 – Noise limits for container repair and maintenance within the Port Zone.</p> <p>The time over any consecutive five-day period at 65dB. This simply not fair. This averaging means any noise above this which happens intermittently at any time over a 5-day period is considered to be acceptable because the 5-day averaging is always results in a lower noise level. If retained the limit should be 60dB. It is my understanding that no other noise rule in the Proposed District Plan has this averaging rule.</p> <p>All the other noise limits should be lowered by 5.</p> <p>If the noise levels remain as they are the Port should do more acoustic treatment at their full cost on affected dwellings in the Port Noise Zones and pay appropriate compensation to residents.</p>	If the noise levels remain as they are the Port should do more acoustic treatment at their full cost on affected dwellings in the Port Noise Zones and pay appropriate compensation to residents.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /NOISE-AC1: General assessment criteria for activities generating noise and/or vibration	Alan Petersen	187.17	Amend	Submission 17 - P32 – NOISE-AC1: General assessment criteria for activities generating noise and/or vibration – Public health – a – add iv – quiet enjoyment of outdoor living spaces.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /NOISE-AC7: New or altered noise sensitive activity within the Port Noise Overlay (NOISE-R11)	Alan Petersen	187.18	Amend	Submission 18 - P34 – NOISE – AC7: - New or altered noise sensitive activity within the Port Noise Overlay (NOISE – R11). Include “quiet enjoyment of outdoor living spaces”.	Seeks to include “quiet enjoyment of outdoor living spaces”.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /NOISE-AC8: New noise sensitive activity within the Port Zone (NOISE-R12)	Alan Petersen	187.19	Amend	Submission 19 - P34 – NOISE –AC8: New noise sensitive activity within the Port Noise Overlay (NOISE – R12). Include “quiet enjoyment of outdoor living spaces”.	Seeks to include “quiet enjoyment of outdoor living spaces”.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration	Richard Milner	190.1	Support	NZHA Supports NOISE-R2A as a variety of construction, maintenance and demolition activities are relied on through the use of helicopters where cranes are not suitable for a variety of reasons. Construction noise therefore should be the limiting factor for aircraft noise in this instance.	Seeks consideration from council that aircraft noise while conducting construction activities for the temporary and infrequent take off and landing should be acceptable within this rule and exempt those commercial action activities from Noise R3.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R3: Noise generated from helicopter landing areas	Richard Milner	190.3	Amend	<p>NZHA supports the rule above for private operations from a fixed location heliport, like at a private residence.</p> <p>NZHA Opposes the rule as it does not take into consideration the commercial temporary and infrequent operations that are necessary for the positive outcomes for the Social, Economic and Cultural benefits of the district.</p> <p>Commercial helicopters are used in a wide range of public good activities. (See Submission for full details). Such activities are essential to the wellbeing of the public. If restricted it would remove jobs, economic benefits and impact helicopter operators' ability to thrive in the region. TC Gabrielle saw the positive good helicopters can do. restrictions would impact commercial helicopters ability to to respond quickly when needed.</p> <p>Operations such as Powerline and Telecommunication Construction, Maintenance and Utility operations are conducted with Helicopters. Limiting the number of run flights from a Temporary landing area to two per week will result in much longer and costly transit times from known airports or a significant increase in Resource Consent applications. Longer transit times will result in increased costs and risk to operators and the public.</p> <p>Operations such as moving plant and equipment onto sites would require large setbacks often rendering them no compliant with either R3 or R3a and therefore unable to be completed. Also the two return flights per day would be exceeded.</p> <p>Submitter Provided examples of operations that would be impacted with</p>	<p>Noise R3A</p> <p>NZHA seeks to have a Commercial Aviation limitation to be included in Noise R3 of: <u>no more than 315 hours or 30 days which ever is greater in a calendar year of helicopter operations on the same site.</u></p> <p>NZHA would also like to see that Setback limitations are removed for Commercial Helicopter operations that are temporary and infrequent and abide by the above limitation.</p> <p><u>Noise R3B</u></p> <p>Should Helicopter activities be conducting Construction, Maintenance or Utility work then Noise R2 applies in place on R3B</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R9: Noise sensitive activities in the City Centre Zone, Mixed Use Zone, or Industrial Zone	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.69	Amend	This rule is intended to apply to noise sensitive activities in the Industrial Zone (in the event they are authorized in the zone) however this is not clarified in activity condition (1). This is an error.	Amend NOISE-R9A(1) to add “Industrial Zones” after City Centre Zone or Mixed Use Zone.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.85	Amend	The Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Treatment Zone should have the same noise limits as the Open Space Zones, rather than the Light Industrial Zone. This is an error.	Amend table in NOISE-S1 to add “and Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Treatment Zone” after “Open Space Zones”.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction /	Ellen Robotham	198.56	Amend	Amend the introductory text to ensure consistent use and interpretation of the terms “Aircraft Noise Overlay”, “Air Noise Boundary”, “Outer Control Boundary” and “Outer Air Noise Overlay” throughout the Proposed Plan. Note new definitions are proposed to assist with this matter. Amendments will ensure the term “boundary” is used to described cadastralised datasets, as opposed to “contours” which are the model outputs (irrespective of property boundaries).  Seek that the last sentence of the introduction is deleted as it is not clear which New Zealand Standards are being referred to. If this reference is to remain, the relevant standards should also be identified.	Amend the introduction as follows:  The purpose of the Aircraft Noise Overlay is to assist in managing the effects on the community that arise from aircraft noise from and around Hawke’s Bay Airport and assist with managing potential reverse sensitivity effects on the airport. The Aircraft Noise Overlay comprises: the Outer Control Boundary.  <del>— Air Noise Boundary: being a boundary line identifying properties lying between the airport and a modelled 65dB Ldn contour fitted to property boundaries; and</del>  <del>— Outer Air Noise Overlay: being properties lying between the 65dB Ldn contour and a modelled dB Ldn contour, fitted to property boundaries.</del>  Within the Aircraft Noise Overlay, <del>se noise boundaries</del> , different land use management controls are in place to manage new and existing activities sensitive to aircraft noise.  The provisions of the Aircraft Noise Overlay work in tandem with the HBAL-2 <u>designation</u> . The designations includes conditions that must be met by Hawke’s Bay Airport, as the requiring authority for Hawke’s Bay Airport.  .....	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-I1: Noise generation can impact on the health and wellbeing of Napier’s communities	Ellen Robotham	198.57	Oppose	Considers that as the section 32 evaluation does not reference the source material with respect to this issue statement, particularly the itemised “adverse health effects and symptoms of adverse health effects of noise...”, the itemised matters should be deleted.	Remove the itemised list from the issue statement as follows:  Noise has the potential to adversely affect people’s health and amenity. Noise may be defined as unwanted sound. Sound may be described in terms of level, frequency, timing, and duration, but noise has connotations of annoyance and disturbance which are subjective factors. Community reaction to noise is determined not only by the sound level, but also by the characteristics of the noise itself, the timing  and duration of the noise, and the general level of exposure of the community to noise.  <del>Adverse health effects and symptoms of adverse health effects of noise include:</del>  <del>physiological and chronic health effects, including cardiovascular disease, hypertension, cognitive impairment, and sleep disturbance;</del> <del>—annoyance;</del> <del>—interference with communications;</del> <del>—interference with the learning process and education;</del> <del>—interference with mental activity;</del> <del>—interference with rest and sleep, and</del> <del>disruption to normal recreational rest and business activities.</del>	Open Submission



Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-13: Noise-sensitive activities can impact on the operation of noise-generating activities	Ellen Robotham	198.58	Amend	<p>Amend issue statement to recognise that the nature of the noise may also contribute to the noise management response.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <p>The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities occurring inside of the ANB and OCB (see full submission for more detail). It allows for a more efficient and cost-effective acoustic treatment package to</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Where there <del>are</del> <u>is</u> high noise-generating activities and infrastructure it is not reasonable or practicable <del>for the noise generators to internalise their noise effects. Therefore</del> <u>the</u> The surrounding land use needs to be managed to avoid the potential for reverse sensitivity. Depending on the level <u>or nature of the noise</u>, activity sensitive to noise may need to be avoided or acoustically treated to insulate from external noises and prevent potential reverse sensitivity effects.</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-16: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport noise	Ellen Robotham	198.59	Amend	<p>The issue statement also needs to recognise that reverse sensitivity effects can and do arise from new and intensification of existing activities sensitive to aircraft noise establishing with the Aircraft Noise Overlays. The issue is therefore much greater than existing uninsulated development being established within the overlays (refer to full submission for more detail).</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>NOISE-16: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport noise</p> <p>Regionally significant infrastructure, such as Hawke's Bay Airport and Napier Port, is situated near residential zones and has operating requirements that prevent it from fully internalising its noise effects.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Noise generated by <u>aircraft operations take-off/approach and landing of aircraft</u> at Hawke's Bay Airport results in <u>amenity and health environmental</u> effects on noise sensitive activities <u>both within and beyond the Aircraft Noise Overlay. experienced well beyond the boundaries of the Airport.</u> Reverse sensitivity effects generated by the establishment of <u>new and intensification of existing activities sensitive to aircraft noise uninsulated development inside the airport noise overlays</u> can also potentially impact the <u>efficient and effective operation of</u> Hawke's Bay Airports <del>operation</del>.</p> <p>Airport noise is addressed through noise limits for the Airport and controls of development of noise-sensitive activities inside the Aircraft Noise Overlays. The approach to noise management is generally consistent with the relevant NZ Standard (<u>NZS6805</u>).</p>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing	Ellen Robotham	198.60	Support	<p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <p>The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities occurring inside of the ANB and OCB (see full submission for more detail). It allows for a more efficient and cost-effective acoustic treatment package to be adopted in the Proposed Plan (see full submission for more detail). The ANB has not been cadastralised, as is generally best practice. This prevents parcels of land being located partially inside of / outside of the</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O3: Reverse sensitivity	Ellen Robotham	198.61	Amend	<p>This objective must also apply to NOISE-16 to ensure consideration is given to potential reverse sensitivity effects on "Significant Infrastructure", in accordance with SD-TI-O4 and NOISE-16.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <p>The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities occurring inside of the ANB and OCB (see full submission for more detail).</p>	Amend as follows:Existing and authorised activities that generate high levels of noise and significant infrastructure are protected from reverse sensitivity effects.Relates to Noise-13, and Noise-14, and Noise-16.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O5: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport	Ellen Robotham	198.62	Support	<p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <p>The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities occurring inside of the ANB and OCB (see full submission for more detail). It allows for a more efficient and cost-effective acoustic treatment package to be adopted in the Proposed Plan (see full submission for more detail). The ANB has not been cadastralised, as is generally best practice. This prevents parcels of land being located partially inside of / outside of the</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P2: Noise-sensitive activities	Ellen Robotham	198.63	Oppose	<p>Further refinements are required to ensure the intention of the policy is clear.</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is not clear what "functional operation" of a noise sensitivity activity means;</li> <li>- The use of "enable" in the chapeau of the policy by "preventing" the activity in the subparagraphs is contradictory.</li> <li>- Subparagraph (a) seeks to prevent noise sensitive activities establishing in inappropriate locations, yet subparagraph (c) allows them to establish in near "high noise generating activities".</li> <li>- It is not clear what comprises a "high noise generating activity".</li> </ul> <p>Refer to full submission for more detailed explanation.</p>	Substantial amendments are made to the policy to address the matters identified.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P4: Reverse sensitivity	Ellen Robotham	198.64	Oppose	<p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities occurring inside of the ANB and OCB (see full submission for more detail).</li> <li>- It allows for a more efficient and cost-effective acoustic treatment package to be adopted in the Proposed Plan (see full submission for more detail).</li> <li>- The ANB has not been cadastralised, as is generally best practice. This prevents parcels of land being located partially inside of / outside of the</li> </ul>	<p>Delete NOISE-P4 and P7 and insert the following new provisions:</p> <p><u>NOISE-P7 Management of Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise: Within the Aircraft Noise Overlay:</u></p> <p>1. <u>Avoid the establishment of new noise sensitive activities within the Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production and Airport Zones (excluding Section 25, Survey Office Plan 3286 Record of Title HBW4/665);</u></p> <p>2. <u>Discourage the establishment of new or the intensification of existing noise sensitive activities within all other zones unless the reverse sensitivity effects on Hawke's Bay Airport can be appropriately avoided.</u></p> <p><u>NOISE-P8: Acoustic treatment of activities sensitive to aircraft noise</u></p> <p><u>Require, as necessary, acoustic treatment and/or mechanical ventilation within any new buildings or any additions or alterations to existing buildings that contain noise sensitive activities within the Aircraft Noise Overlay.</u></p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P7: Hawke's Bay Airport Noise Overlay	Ellen Robotham	198.65	Oppose	<p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities occurring inside of the ANB and OCB (see full submission for more detail).</li> <li>- It allows for a more efficient and cost-effective acoustic treatment package to be adopted in the Proposed Plan (see full submission for more detail).</li> <li>- The ANB has not been cadastralised, as is generally best practice. This prevents parcels of land being located partially inside of / outside of the</li> </ul>	<p>Delete NOISE-P4 and P7 and insert the following new provisions:</p> <p><u>NOISE-P7 Management of Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise: Within the Aircraft Noise Overlay:</u></p> <p>1. <u>Avoid the establishment of new noise sensitive activities within the Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production and Airport Zones (excluding Section 25, Survey Office Plan 3286 Record of Title HBW4/665);</u></p> <p>2. <u>Discourage the establishment of new or the intensification of existing noise sensitive activities within all other zones unless the reverse sensitivity effects on Hawke's Bay Airport can be appropriately avoided.</u></p> <p><u>NOISE-P8: Acoustic treatment of activities sensitive to aircraft noise</u></p> <p><u>Require, as necessary, acoustic treatment and/or mechanical ventilation within any new buildings or any additions or alterations to existing buildings that contain noise sensitive activities within the Aircraft Noise Overlay.</u></p>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general)	Ellen Robotham	198.66	Amend	<p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities occurring inside of the ANB and OCB (see full submission for more detail).</li> <li>- It allows for a more efficient and cost-effective acoustic treatment package to be adopted in the Proposed Plan (see full submission for more detail).</li> <li>- The ANB has not been cadastralised, as is generally best practice. This prevents parcels of land being located partially inside of / outside of the</li> </ul>	Amend Noise-R1 to ensure it does not capture aircraft and address other issues of interpretation.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration	Ellen Robotham	198.67	Oppose	<p>The proposed rule seeks to emulate NZS6803, however lacks the nuances that allow for exceedances to occur and how to manage those exceedances. Without recognition of potential exceedances, undue consenting costs will be incurred for development throughout the District.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <p>The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities</p>	Delete the rule or include reference to NZS6805 as a standard for construction activities.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R3: Noise generated from helicopter landing areas	Ellen Robotham	198.68	Oppose	<p>The proposed rule should refer to NZS6807, as per the approach used in NOISE-R8. For clarification purposes, the rule should also expressly exclude helicopter operations at Hawke’s Bay Airport which are already accounted for in the Aircraft Noise Boundaries.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <p>The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities</p>	Update the rule as per NOISE-R8 and exclude helicopter noise from the Airport as this is managed by way of designation.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R14: Activities sensitive to aircraft noise inside the Outer Control Boundary (55dB LDN)	Ellen Robotham	198.69	Oppose	<p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <p>The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities occurring inside of the ANB and OCB (see full submission for more detail). It allows for a more efficient and cost-effective acoustic treatment package to be adopted in the Proposed Plan (see full submission for more detail). The ANB has not been cadastralised, as is generally best practice. This prevents parcels of land being located partially inside of / outside of the</p>	<p>Amend and include new provisions as follows:</p> <p>NOISE-R14 Activities sensitive to aircraft noise inside the <u>Aircraft Noise Overlay Outer Control Boundary (55dB LDN)</u></p> <p>NOISE-R14A</p> <p>Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p>1. <u>the activity is a residential activity located within the General Residential, Rural Lifestyle Zone or located on Section 25, Survey Office Plan 3286 Record of Title HBW4/665 and:</u></p> <p>2. <u>the density does not exceed the following:</u></p> <p>a. General Residential Zone: 1 dwelling per 350m<sup>2</sup>; or</p> <p>b. Rural Lifestyle Zone: 1 dwelling per 2,500m<sup>2</sup> ; or</p> <p>c. <u>Section 25, Survey Office Plan 3286 Record of Title HBW4/665: two dwellings.</u></p> <p>3. Compliance with standard NOISE-S5.</p> <p><u>Activity Status: Discretionary Where:</u></p>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /General	Ellen Robotham	198.70	Amend	<p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <p>The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities occurring inside of the ANB and OCB (see full submission for more detail). It allows for a more efficient and cost-effective acoustic treatment package to be adopted in the Proposed Plan (see full submission for more detail). The ANB has not been cadastralised, as is generally best practice. This prevents parcels of land being located partially inside of / outside of the</p>	<p>Include new provisions as follows:</p> <p><u><a href="#">NOISE-R16 Short term Visitor Accommodation with the Aircraft Noise Overlay</a></u></p> <p>Activity Status: Restricted discretionary Where:</p> <p><u><a href="#">1. Compliance with standard NOISE-S5 (1).</a></u></p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <p><u><a href="#">1. Constraints on the maximum duration of stay to minimise exposure to aircraft noise.</a></u></p> <p><u><a href="#">2. The acoustic treatment and ventilation of buildings to reduce aircraft noise exposure.</a></u></p> <p><u><a href="#">3. The use of building layout and design to minimise aircraft noise exposure.</a></u></p> <p><u><a href="#">4. The extent and location of outdoor amenity areas.</a></u></p> <p><u><a href="#">5. The extent to which effects as a result of the activity could give rise to adverse reverse sensitivity effects on Hawke’s Bay Airport.</a></u></p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R16: Aircraft noise at Air Noise Boundary and Outer Control Boundary	Ellen Robotham	198.71	Oppose	<p>It is inappropriate to replicate the aircraft noise management obligations that are managed under the proposed Airport Purposes Designation.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <p>- The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities occurring inside of the ANB and OCB (see full submission for more detail).</p> <p>- It allows for a more efficient and cost-effective acoustic treatment package</p>	Delete NOISE-R16.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S1: General noise limits	Ellen Robotham	198.72	Oppose	<p>The noise limits as they apply to the Airport Zone are unduly restrictive and require further refinement. In the context of the Airport, compliance with the noise limits should be measured at the notional boundary.</p> <p>Furthermore, reference to NZS6802:2008 should be sufficient to management noise effects.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p>	Amend to address the issues raised in the submission.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S5: Acoustic treatment for activities sensitive to aircraft noise inside the Outer Control Boundary	Ellen Robotham	198.73	Oppose	<p>Oppose standard 5.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <p>- The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities occurring inside of the ANB and OCB (see full submission for more detail).                      - It allows for a more efficient and cost-effective acoustic treatment package to be adopted in the Proposed Plan (see full submission for more detail).</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Purpose: to manage activities sensitive to aircraft noise <u>within the General Residential or Rural Lifestyle Zone or existing Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise within the Airport Zone where exposed to in areas around the Hawke's Bay airport that are exposed to aircraft noise levels over 55 dB LDN. This will ensure that the continued operation of the airport is not compromised and the outdoor amenity and health of the community is adequately managed.</u></p> <p>1. Any noise sensitive space inside an activity sensitive to aircraft noise or an addition or alteration to an activity sensitive to aircraft noise which creates a new noise sensitive space within the <u>Air Noise Overlay Outer Control Boundary</u> shall be designed to achieve an indoor design sound level of 40 dB Ldn.</p> <p>2. Within the General Residential or Rural Lifestyle Compliance with 1 above shall be demonstrated by <u>either:</u></p> <p>a. <u>submitting a certificate to the Council from a person suitably qualified in acoustics stating that the proposed construction will achieve the Indoor Design Sound Level with the windows open; or</u></p> <p>b. <u>installing and maintaining a mechanical ventilation system in the noise sensitive rooms that:</u></p>	Open Submission



Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria	Ellen Robotham	198.74	Amend	<p>Amend AC-9. The assessment criteria is too narrowly focused on achieving an internal noise environment to manage reverse sensitivity effects.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <p>The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities occurring inside of the ANB and OCB (see full submission for more detail). It allows for a more efficient and cost-effective acoustic treatment package to</p>	<p>Amend the assessment criteria as follows:</p> <p>NOISE-AC9: Activities sensitive to aircraft noise in the Aircraft Noise Overlay (NOISE-R14 <u>and R15</u>)</p> <p>The following assessment criteria apply in addition to NOISE-AC1:</p> <p>Reverse sensitivity effects on the safe and efficient operation of the airport</p> <p>a. Whether the design, including location, methods, and construction techniques proposed is likely to provide an internal noise environment that is likely to ensure that the internal noise levels are reasonable for the occupants <del>and will avoid or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects on the airport.</del></p> <p>b. <u>The ability to achieve acceptable outdoor acoustic amenity;</u></p> <p>c. <u>The extent to which effects, as a result of the sensitivity of activities to current and future noise generation from aircraft, are proposed to be managed, including avoidance of any effect that may limit the operation, maintenance or upgrade of Hawke's Bay Airport.</u></p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction /General	Grant Russell	202.27	Amend	<p>Considers Noise - Noise Introduction should be amended for specificity and to better correlate with NOISE-R4: Noise generated from Watercraft.</p>	<p>Amend Noise - Noise Introduction as follows:</p> <p>- noise limits for helicopter landing areas, <del>watercraft-jet boats</del>, audible bird scaring devices, and frost protection fans;</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction /General	Grant Russell	202.28	Amend	<p>Considers Noise - Noise Introduction should be amended to reference acoustic treatment for both the Port and the Airport.</p>	<p>Amend Noise - Noise Introduction as follows:</p> <p>- acoustic treatment requirements for noise-sensitive activities in areas affected by the Port <u>and Hawke's Bay Airport.</u></p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction /	Grant Russell	202.29	Amend	<p>Considers that Noise - Noise Introduction "The purpose of the Aircraft Noise Overlay..." should be amended / moved for relevance to NOISE-I6: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport noise.</p>	<p>Amend Noise - Noise Introduction "The purpose of the Aircraft Noise Overlay..." for relevance by moving this instead to NOISE-I6: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport noise.</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction /General	Grant Russell	202.30	Amend	<p>Considers an amendment is necessary as the approach to noise management is consistent with BOTH the Port and Airport Noise Standards i.e. plural.</p>	<p>Amend Noise - Introduction wording (last paragraph) to include that the approach to noise management set out within this chapter is generally consistent with the NZ Standards.</p>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-11: Noise generation can impact on the health and wellbeing of Napier's communities	Grant Russell	202.31	Amend	Considers NOISE-11: Noise generation can impact on the health and wellbeing of Napier's communities contains unnecessary duplication.	<p>Amend NOISE-11: Noise generation can impact on the health and wellbeing of Napier's communities as follows:</p> <p>Noise has the potential to adversely affect people's health and amenity. Noise may be defined as unwanted sound. Sound may be described in terms of level, frequency, timing, and duration, but noise has connotations of annoyance and disturbance which are subjective factors. Community reaction to noise is determined not only by the sound level, but also by the characteristics of the noise itself, the timing and duration of the noise, and the general level of exposure of the community to noise. Adverse health effects and symptoms of adverse health effects of noise include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· physiological and chronic health <del>effects, including cardiovascular disease, hypertension, cognitive impairment, and sleep disturbance;</del></li> <li>· annoyance;</li> <li>· interference with communications;</li> <li>· interference with the learning process and education;</li> <li>· interference with <u>concentration</u> <del>mental activity;</del></li> <li>· interference with rest and sleep, and</li> </ul>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-13: Noise-sensitive activities can impact on the operation of noise-generating activities	Grant Russell	202.32	Amend	Considers that NOISE-13: Noise-sensitive activities can impact on the operation of noise-generating activities contains unnecessary duplication.	<p>Amend NOISE-13: Noise-sensitive activities can impact on the operation of noise-generating activities as follows:</p> <p>NOISE-13: Noise-sensitive activities can impact on the operation of noise-generating activities</p> <p>Where there <del>are</del> <u>are</u> high noise-generating activities and infrastructure, <del>and where</del> <u>and where</u> it is not reasonable or practicable <del>for the noise generators</del> to internalise their noise effects, <del>Therefore</del> the surrounding land use needs to be managed to avoid the potential for reverse sensitivity.</p> <p>Depending on the level of noise, activity sensitive to noise may need to be avoided or acoustically treated to insulate from external noises and prevent potential reverse sensitivity effects.</p>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-I6: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport noise	Grant Russell	202.33	Amend	Considers Additional wording is necessary for consistency with the Hawke's Bay Airport paragraph (last paragraph in NOISE-I6: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport noise.	<p>Amend NOISE-I6: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport noise as follows:</p> <p>NOISE-I6: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport noise</p> <p>Regionally significant infrastructure, such as Hawke's Bay Airport and Napier Port, is situated near residential zones and has operating requirements that prevent it from fully internalising its noise effects.</p> <p>Despite adopting all practicable options to internalise noise, the port may, at times, generate a level of noise outside its zone boundary that is greater than would otherwise be expected in adjacent zones. Residents overlooking or near to Napier Port should be aware that the level of effects may be higher than experienced in other residential areas of the city and in some cases at a level that would normally be incompatible with traditional residential activity.</p> <p>Special noise standards and a noise management plan are appropriate, permitting the port to operate while recognising and mitigating its adverse effects on nearby noise-sensitive activities. The approach to noise management is generally consistent with the relevant NZ Standard.</p> <p>Noise generated by take off / approach and landing of aircraft at Hawke's Bay Airport results in environmental effects on noise</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P2: Noise-sensitive activities	Grant Russell	202.34	Amend	The submitter considers that NOISE-P2: Noise-sensitive activities contains unnecessary word duplication from that already discussed in the Introduction and Noise - Issues e.g. NOISE-I1: Noise generation can impact on the health and wellbeing of Napier's communities.	<p>Amend NOISE-P2: Noise-sensitive activities as follows:</p> <p>Enable the functional operation of noise sensitive activities by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>preventing noise sensitive activities from establishing in inappropriate locations;</li> <li>preventing high noise-generating activities other than roads and railway lines from establishing in residential zones, and</li> <li>where noise-sensitive activities establish in areas exposed to high noise-generating activities, require the acoustic treatment to achieve an appropriate internal noise level <del>to enable uninterrupted sleep at night and an internal environment for uses that do not involve overnight accommodation that protects people from unreasonable noise.</del></li> </ol> <p>Relates to NOISE-O1 and Noise-O3</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P4: Reverse sensitivity	Grant Russell	202.35	Amend	Considers that with regards to NOISE-P4: Reverse sensitivity, there are controls proposed for noise sensitive developments in the residential zones inside the Port Noise Boundary to specifically address reverse sensitivity.	<p>Amend NOISE-P4: Reverse sensitivity as follows:</p> <p>Restrict the development of noise-sensitive activities within:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>the Port Noise Boundary;</u></li> <li>the Air Noise Boundary, and</li> <li>other locations where ventilation and acoustic insulation standards are not met.</li> </ol>	Open Submission

# NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P6: Port noise	Grant Russell	202.36	Amend	The submitter considers that NOISE-P6: Port noise should be reworded to align with NOISE-R12: New or altered noise sensitive activity within the Port Noise Overlay.	Amend NOISE-P6: Port noise as follows:  NOISE-P6: Port noise  The adverse effects of port noise are managed by a combination of controls, including:  a. District Plan rules on noise generation within the relevant zone;  b. a Port noise management plan, <del>and</del>  c. <u>minimum sound insulation performance requirements for any new or altered noise sensitive activities within the Port Noise Overlays, and</u>  d. acoustic treatment of other noise-sensitive activities within the Port Noise Overlays.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P8: Construction	Grant Russell	202.37	Support	Supports the intent of NOISE-P8: Construction Policy with amendments proposed for the corresponding NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration.	Retain NOISE-P8: Construction Policy in its entirety as notified. (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /General	Grant Russell	202.38	Support	Supports Noise - Rules Table subject to suggested amendments to Rules in the Table for the purposes of clarity.	Retain Noise - Rules Table provisions in general apart from amendments for clarity.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table / NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration	Grant Russell	202.39	Amend	Considers NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration should be amended to better align with NOISE-P8: Construction Policy.	Amend NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration as follows:  <u>Exceedances of the construction noise limits are common, often unavoidable and not necessarily unreasonable provided a Construction noise management plan is in place to address residual effects.</u>  <u>Construction 'noise limits' should be applied as 'trigger levels' for closer scrutiny (as applied, and more explicitly labelled, in the newer version of British Standard BS5228 on which 6803 was based).</u>  <u>Very few urban construction activities would comply with the noise limits at all times and would require a consent. The consents add time and cost, but routinely end up with a requirement for a construction noise and vibration management plan (CNVMP). The consenting process would be low value. In short, consider that exceedances should be enabled via a certification process, whereby a suitably qualified and experienced professional prepares the CNVMP that is required to be certified by Council before the works commence.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table / NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration	Grant Russell	202.40	Amend	Considers that NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration should be amended.	Amend NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration as follows:  1. <del>Noise (including vibration)</del> from construction activities shall be measured and assessed in accordance with NZS 6803:1999 Acoustics Construction noise. <del>except where varied by the rules below.</del>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration	Grant Russell	202.42	Amend	The submitter considers that NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration Clause 6. should be amended to provide greater clarity.	Amend NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration Clause 6. as follows:  Where there is no practicable way of measuring outside a building, and where the windows and doors of the building are normally closed, the upper limits for noise inside the building shall be those set out in clauses 2 - 5 <del>and 3</del> above minus 20 dB.	Open Submission

# NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration	Grant Russell	202.43	Amend	The submitter considers that NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration should be amended around a certification process, lower daytime PPV threshold and a newer 2016 version of the DIN standard reference.	Amend NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration so that limits are used as a trigger for a construction noise and vibration management plan (CNVMP) certification process and the daytime threshold is lowered to 1mm/s Peak Particle Velocity (PPV) if that approach is adopted as per Submission 202.39. The submitter also recommends referencing the newer 2016 version of the German Industrial DIN Standard for Vibrations in buildings [DIN 4150-3:2016 presumably as opposed to DIN 4150-3:1999 in Clause 7. a.].  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R4: Noise generated from Watercraft	Grant Russell	202.44	Amend	Considers NOISE-R4: Noise generated from Watercraft Rule is relevant to jet boats on rivers and not all watercraft.	Amend NOISE-R4: Noise generated from Watercraft Rule as follows:  NOISE-R4: Noise generated from <u>jet boats</u> <del>Watercraft</del>  1. Powered <u>jet boats</u> <del>watercraft</del> shall be fitted with effective mufflers during all movement on water.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R10: Noise sensitive activities in the High Land Transport Noise Overlay	Grant Russell	202.45	Amend	Considers that in relation to the NOISE-R10: Noise sensitive activities in the High Land Transport Noise Overlay Rule, people building next to SH50 should be required to protect themselves from road noise. Noise generated from trucks heading to the Port affects noise complaints and social license. This is referenced in the Port noise Rule NOISE-R12.3, and is also consistent / repeated in NOISE-R9.3, the Airport rule NOISE-S5 and NOISE-S6. "Measured and assessed in accordance with NZS 2107" is also preferred.	Amend NOISE-R10: Noise sensitive activities in the High Land Transport Noise Overlay Rule references as follows:  <del>does not generate more than 35 dB LAeq(30s) when measured 2-m away from any grille or diffuser in accordance with AS/NZS 2107:2016 "Acoustics - Recommended design sound levels and reverberation times for building interiors".</del>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R12: New or altered noise sensitive activity within the Port Noise Overlay	Grant Russell	202.46	Support	Supports NOISE-R12: New or altered noise activity within the Port Noise Overlay Rule.	Retain NOISE-R12: New or altered noise activity within the Port Noise Overlay Rule in its entirety.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R13: New noise sensitive activity within the Port Zone	Grant Russell	202.47	Support	The submitter considers that NOISE-R13: New noise sensitive activity within the Port Zone Rule is supported.	Seeks to retain NOISE-R13: New noise sensitive activity within the Port Zone Rule as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S1: General noise limits	Grant Russell	202.48	Oppose	Opposes NOISE-S1: General noise limits Clause 3. as it conflicts in part, or duplicates, Noise-S1.2 which is appropriate and sufficient on its own.	Delete NOISE-S1: General noise limits Clause 3. in its entirety as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S3: General noise limits within the Port Zone	Grant Russell	202.49	Amend	Considers NOISE-S3: General noise limits within the Port Zone Standard reference to NZS 6809 refers to NZS 6801 for measurement except where it varies the measurement method.	Amend NOISE-S3: General noise limits within the Port Zone Standard as follows:  6. Noise must be measured <del>in accordance with the provisions of NZS 6801:2008 Acoustics Measurement of Environmental Sound</del> and assessed in accordance with NZS 6809:1999 Acoustics Port Noise Management and Land Use Planning.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S5: Acoustic treatment for activities sensitive to aircraft noise inside the Outer Control Boundary	Grant Russell	202.50	Support	Supports NOISE-S5: Acoustic treatment for activities sensitive to aircraft noise inside the Outer Control Boundary.	Retain NOISE-S5: Acoustic treatment for activities sensitive to aircraft noise inside the Outer Control Boundary as notified.	Open Submission

# NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /NOISE-AC1: General assessment criteria for activities generating noise and/or vibration	Grant Russell	202.51	Support	Considers NOISE-AC1: General assessment criteria for activities generating noise and / or vibration Assessment Criteria are supported in part with changes in wording required for clarity and consistency.	Amend NOISE-AC1: General assessment criteria for activities generating noise and / or vibration Assessment Criteria as follows:  NOISE-AC1: General assessment criteria for activities generating noise and / or vibration  Public health  a. The extent to which the noise or vibration generated will adversely affect health and wellbeing of people, <del>including consideration of</del> <u>having regard to</u> :  i. whether the noise or vibration generation will occur at night when disturbance to <del>rest and</del> sleep should be avoided or minimised;  ii. interference with speech communications, the learning process and education, instruction from caregivers or teachers, and <u>concentration mental activity</u> , and  iii. existing background levels and the total cumulative level of noise.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise /	Mike Doesburg	209.6	Oppose	Opposes internal noise rules as the provisions provide for greater internal noise amenity during the day than at night.	Amend Rule NOISE-R10A 1. as follows:  Type of use Internal noise limits  Bedrooms and sleeping areas <b>Rail noise</b> - <del>35</del> 40 dB LAeq(1hr) between 7 a.m. and 10 p.m., and 40 35 dB LAeq(1hr) between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. <b>Road traffic noise</b> - 40 dB LAeq(24hr) ...	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /	Dominic Adams	221.5	Amend	It is important to recognise the benefits of activities that generate appropriate levels of noise during the support of primary production, whilst balancing the health and wellbeing of people and communities.	Seeks to insert new objective: <u>The benefits of activities that generate noise (such as primary production activities and supporting activities) are recognised, where the adverse effects from noise are compatible with the anticipated purpose, character, and amenity values of the relevant zone(s) and do not compromise public health, safety, and wellbeing of people and communities.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O3: Reverse sensitivity	Dominic Adams	221.6	Support	It is important to protect existing and authorised activities from reverse sensitivity effects.	Seeks to retain the objective.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /	Dominic Adams	221.7	Amend	Ballance seeks inclusion of a policy that enables noise generating activities and recognises agricultural aviation as an ancillary activity supporting primary production.	Seeks to Insert new policy: <u>Noise generating activities that have a limited duration and frequency and support primary production in the rural environment (in particular, audible bird scaring devices, agricultural aviation and frost protection devices, and harvesters) is enabled by exempting these activities from noise limits, subject to reasonable use.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general)	Dominic Adams	221.8	Amend	Ballance seeks to have agricultural aviation provided for as a permitted activity in the plan.	Seeks to Amend the rule by adding: a. the noise from the use of vehicles, mobile machinery, <u>agricultural aviation activity or other mobile or portable equipment where they are used on a seasonal or intermittent basis for agricultural, horticultural, viticultural, or forestry activities that are permitted by the Plan;</u>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R7: Noise generated from temporary events	Amelia Longley	222.127	Amend	Clarify limits for consistency with the recommendations for temporary events made Council's acoustic expert. (Styles Groups Noise Review 8 August 2019).	<p>Amend noise limits for temporary events rules to be consistent with recommendations in Council's acoustic expert report (Styles Groups Noise Review 8 August 2019) (or words to similar effect).NOISE-R7: Noise generated from temporary noise events NOISE-R7A</p> <p>Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:1. Amplified sound equipment must only be operated between the hours of:</p> <p>a. 10.00 a.m. to <del>11.00</del>10.00 p.m. <u>Sunday to Thursday inclusive</u></p> <p>b. <u>10am-11pm Fridays, Saturdays and day preceding a public holiday.</u></p> <p>2. The following are exempt from compliance with clause 1 above:</p> <p>a. on 31st December of any calendar year, amplified sound equipment may be used until 1.00 a.m. the following day.3. Any sound checks that include testing and balancing of sound systems, sound equipment and vocal checks by performers must not:</p> <p>a. exceed a cumulative period of <del>six</del><u>3</u> hours, and</p> <p>b. commence before 9.00 a.m. on any day and shall be completed by 7.00 p.m. of any day of the temporary activity.</p> <p>4. Noise generated from temporary events must not exceed <u>75 dB L Aeq (5 min) for events on Sunday to Thursday</u> <del>85 or 80</del> <u>dB L Aeq (5 min) for events held on Saturdays or Sundays or any day preceding a public holiday</u> when measured at any other site,</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S1: General noise limits	Alicia McKinnon	230.12	Amend	<p>opposes any increase to the noise limits for the Mixed Use Zone and the proposed new General Industrial Zone in Ahuriri</p> <p>The noise limits that are proposed for the Mixed Use Zone should be at least the same as those in the Napier Operative District Plan. However, from experience it is unlikely that the noise limits proposed on their own will be adequate to mitigate against any adverse effects of noise from industrial activities on residential amenity.</p> <p>NCC has a responsibility to manage the effects of land use and noise, including the effects on amenity values that may be affected by noise.</p> <p>Unreasonable noise can be managed at the source, through for example: modification of equipment used that emit low levels of noise, moving activities on a site to be far away as possible from residential boundaries, narrowing hours of operation particularly for noisy activities, or barriers to control/reduce noise. It is also possible to incorporate Noise Management Plans into a district plan through permitted activity standards.</p>	<p>Amend the NOISE-S1 General noise limits standards table as follows:</p> <p>Zone</p> <p>Mixed Use Zone</p> <p>7am to 7pm LAeq(15min) - <u>55dB</u></p> <p>7am to 10pm LAeq(15min) - <u>50dB</u></p> <p>10pm to 7am the following day LAeq (15min) - <u>45dB</u></p> <p>10pm to 7am the following day LAFMax - <u>75dB</u></p> <p><u>General industrial zone in Ahuriri</u></p> <p><u>7am to 7pm LAeq(15min) - 55dB</u></p> <p><u>7am to 10pm LAeq(15min) - 50dB</u></p> <p><u>10pm to 7am the following day LAeq (15min) - 45dB</u></p> <p><u>10pm to 7am the following day LAFMax - 75dB</u></p> <p>NCC should explore further ways to manage unreasonable noise for the Mixed Use Zone. Where residential amenity is being impacted, this could include establishing Noise Management Plans for each occupier of land in the Mixed Use Zone. Residents should be consulted in the preparation of any Noise Management Plan to ensure all options are considered and appropriate noise mitigation measures are explored.</p>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-12: Noise generation can detract from amenity values	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.32	Amend	Supports that educational facilities are generally located within residential zones.  requests that 'education facilities' be amended to read 'educational facilities for consistency across the plan.	Amend to:  Noise generation can detract from amenity values  The degree of quiet or peacefulness in an area contributes to the amenity values appreciated by its occupants. Suburban residential areas, for example, are generally quieter than commercial centres. However, non-residential activities such as neighbourhood shops, cafes, educational facilities, and churches can be accommodated in these communities even though they generate noise. Appropriate noise standards need to be established and complied with to ensure that these activities are enabled while maintaining the amenity values of the residential area.  Excessive noise can also be created by the use of high-powered stereo systems by residents.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-13: Noise-sensitive activities can impact on the operation of noise-generating activities	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.33	Amend	The link for the definition for activity sensitive to noise in NOISE-13 is not consistent to the plan's definition for 'Activities Sensitive to noise'. The ministry seeks the link to this definition be amended to match the proposed definition in the definitions chapter.	Amend to:  Noise-sensitive activities can impact on the operation of noise-generating activities  Where there is high noise-generating activities and infrastructure it is not reasonable or practicable for the noise generators to internalise their noise effects. Therefore, the surrounding land use needs to be managed to avoid the potential for reverse sensitivity. Depending on the level of noise, activity sensitive to noise may need to be avoided or acoustically treated to insulate from external noises and prevent potential reverse sensitivity effects.  Definition link states:  Activities sensitive to noise <del>means any dwelling, visitor accommodation, boarding house, marae, papakāinga, integrated residential development, retirement village, supported residential care, care centres</del>  <u>means any dwelling, visitor accommodation, boarding house, marae, papakāinga, integrated residential development, retirement village, supported residential care, care centres, lecture theatres in tertiary education facilities, education facilities, and healthcare facilities with an overnight stay facility.</u>	Open Submission



Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.34	Amend	<p>Supports the allowance of higher levels of noise from educational facilities during school hours and the occasional temporary event. Educational facilities are a critical form of social infrastructure required to meet the needs of surrounding residential catchments. Educational facilities often do generate noise from various outdoor activities, like sports events or lunchtime play. These noise events are periodic and only occur during daylight hours mostly on weekdays. The Ministry support any provisions that accommodates noise generated from educational facilities.</p> <p>The Ministry does request that 'education facilities' be amended to read 'educational facilities' for consistency across the plan and to match the definition of the term.</p>	<p>Amend to:</p> <p>Amenity values, health, and wellbeing</p> <p>Maintain the anticipated amenity values of the zone and provide for the health and wellbeing of the community by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. controlling the noise effects throughout the city to meet the relevant objectives for the zone;</li> <li>b. managing the interface of different zones to protect the amenity values of residential and other less noisy areas of the city, and</li> </ul> <p>providing for higher levels of noise generation for educational facilities during the day on weekdays and a limited number of temporary events where these activities contribute to community wellbeing and potential adverse effects on amenity values are minimised.</p> <p>Relates to NOISE-O1</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P2: Noise-sensitive activities	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.35	Amend	<p>Supports the provision NOISE-P2 which protects noise sensitive activities from the effects of high noise-generating activities. Recommends the removal of a) as it is not clear what an 'inappropriate location' would be and b) already address's the concerns of a). Also considers the removal of the word unreasonable from b) as unreasonable noise cannot be measured. This should be amended to discourage noise that exceeds the permitted noise levels in the relevant zoning provisions.</p>	<p>Seeks to Amend NOISE-P2 to the following:</p> <p>Noise-sensitive activities</p> <p>Enable the functional operation of noise sensitive activities by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>a. preventing noise sensitive activities from establishing in inappropriate locations;</del></li> <li>a. preventing high noise-generating activities other than roads and railway lines from establishing in residential zones, and</li> <li>b. where noise-sensitive activities establish in areas exposed to high noise- generating activities, require the acoustic treatment to achieve an appropriate internal noise level to enable uninterrupted sleep at night and an internal environment for uses that do not involve overnight accommodation that protects people from <del>unreasonable noise that exceeds the noise standards for the zone as defined in this District Plan.</del></li> </ul> <p>Relates to NOISE-O1 and NOISE-O3</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general)	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.36	Support	<p>Supports a restricted discretionary activity status when the noise standards in NOISE-S2 are not meet. As the Ministry recognises that educational facilities can generate noise from outdoor activities like sports and children playing.</p>	<p>Retain as Proposed.</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R9: Noise sensitive activities in the City Centre Zone, Mixed Use Zone, or Industrial Zone	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.37	Support	<p>Supports the proposed noise standards for noise sensitive activities (which includes educational facilities). The Ministry excepts restricted discretionary activity status if compliance cannot be met.</p>	<p>Retain as proposed.</p>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)						
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S2: Noise from education facilities	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.38	Amend	Amend NOISE-S2, the Ministry requests that 'education facilities' be amended to read 'educational facilities' for consistency across the plan and to match the proposed definition of the term. The Ministry also requests that noise is measured from the boundary not within the school site. Often the Ministry school sites can be designed in ways to locate the noise generating activities away from the boundary of residential areas so noise can dissipate before reaching the boundary. However, the Ministry supports a restricted discretionary activity status when the noise standards in NOISE-S2 are not meet.	<p>Seeks to Amend the following:</p> <p>Noise from educational facilities</p> <p>1. Noise generated from any educational facility when measured <del>from within</del> the boundary of any <u>adjacent or adjoining</u> site in a residential zone or any <u>adjacent or adjoining</u> notional boundary within a rural zone must not exceed the levels below unless the relevant zone in which the facility is located provides for higher noise levels in Rule NOISE-S1:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Time</td> <td>Noise Level</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Monday to Friday 7.00 a.m.</td> <td>55 dB LAeq (15 min) to 6.00 p.m.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All other times and all day on public holidays</td> <td>40 dB LAeq(15min) and 75 dB LAFmax</td> </tr> </table> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public health;</li> <li>Amenity values, and</li> <li>Functional and operational requirements of educational facilities.</li> </ol>	Time	Noise Level	Monday to Friday 7.00 a.m.	55 dB LAeq (15 min) to 6.00 p.m.	All other times and all day on public holidays	40 dB LAeq(15min) and 75 dB LAFmax	Open Submission
Time	Noise Level											
Monday to Friday 7.00 a.m.	55 dB LAeq (15 min) to 6.00 p.m.											
All other times and all day on public holidays	40 dB LAeq(15min) and 75 dB LAFmax											
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /NOISE-AC1: General assessment criteria for activities generating noise and/or vibration	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.39	Amend	Amend NOSIE-AC1, to refer to the 'learning environment' rather than the 'learning process', as council's proposed wording is unclear. 'Learning environment' provides clarity to plan users that effects on productive classroom environment need to be assessed. However, the Ministry does support NOISE-AC1 as it allows the effects of noise generating activities to be assessed in relation to the effects on education to reduce or prevent interference or disruption to productive learning environments.	<p>Seeks to Amend the following:</p> <p>Public health</p> <p>a. The extent to which the noise or vibration generated will adversely affect health and wellbeing of people, including consideration of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>whether the noise or vibration generation will occur when disturbance to rest and sleep should be avoided or minimised;</li> <li>interference with speech communications, the learning <del>environment and process and education</del>, instruction from caregivers or teachers, and mental activity, and existing background levels and the total cumulative level of noise.</li> </ol>	Open Submission						

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration	James Whitlock	232.1	Amend	Notes that the noise rules are copied from the Auckland Unitary Plan, with some minor improvements including fixing wording and technical errors. Considers that these rules have caused huge consenting issues in Auckland, adding unnecessary hurdles and expense - especially to small projects. Notes that consenting planners have come to treat the noise and vibration limits as absolute thresholds, but they should be applied as trigger levels for consultation and management to address potential effects. For condition 1, Considers that NZS 6803 only addresses noise, not vibration so there is nothing in the following rules that would require this exception. For condition 2, considers that construction noise infringes the noise levels in NZS 6803 all the time - particularly in cities and small-lot residential areas. The distances between construction equipment and neighbouring buildings are too short for compliance. Activities that cause infringements of these limits should be managed and mitigated in accordance with the best practicable option (BPO). A management plan approach is the best way to address this, and all construction projects and Auckland (and other cities around NZ) successfully implements this approach. For condition 7, notes that the 1999 version of DIN 4150-3 is outdated. Submitter proposes deletion of daytime vibration limits (2 mm/s PPV) due to lack of standard basis and causing consenting issues. Notes Peak value nature of PPV makes compliance difficult and predictions conservative. Like noise, vibration can be managed via a management plan; night-time limits are retained. Notes that the Australasian Association of Acoustic Consultants is currently drafting a guideline document to accompany NZS 6803. Its objective is to help its members to apply the standard's provisions sensibly and consistently. Refer to original submission for full details and attachment.	Amend as below: 1. Noise <del>(including vibration)</del> from construction activities shall be measured and assessed in accordance with NZS 6803:1999 Acoustics Construction noise, <del>except where varied by the rules below.</del> 2. Noise from construction activities in all zones must be <u>managed to comply with not exceed</u> the levels in the table below, as far as practicable, when measured 1 m from the facade of any building that contains a noise-sensitive activity that is occupied during the works. ... 7. Construction and demolition activities must be controlled to ensure any resulting vibration does not exceed: a. The limits set out in German Industrial Standard DIN 4150-3 <del>(1999 2016)</del> : Structural vibration - Part 3: Effects of vibration on structures when measured in accordance with that standard on any structure not on the same site, and  b. The <u>vibration amenity</u> limits in the table below when measured in the corner of the floor of the storey of interest for multi-storey buildings, or within 500 mm of ground level at the foundation of a single-storey building.  Receiver - Occupied <u>building containing</u> a noise sensitive activity Period - Night time 10.00 p.m. to 7.30 a.m. <del>Daytime 7.30 a.m. to 10.00 p.m.</del>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Peter Holley	234.7		Sometimes sound checks an exceed noise limitations, therefore sound checks within the specified times are exempt from the noise limitations.	Seeks to Amend PREC5-R3(6) so that concert and entertainment activities in compliance with the condition are exempt from noise limits in the noise chapter NOISE-S1.  Details are stated in the full submission.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	denise fastier	245.2	Oppose	Considers that there is unreasonable traffic noise outside excepted hours in a mixed residential/ commercial zone. Seeks quiet times between 10pm to 6am so residents can sleep.	Seeks quiet times between 10pm to 6am so residents can sleep. No specific relief sought	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S3: General noise limits within the Port Zone	denise fastier	245.3	Oppose	Considers that there is unreasonable traffic noise outside excepted hours in a mixed residential/ commercial zone. Seeks quiet times between 10pm to 6am so residents can sleep.	Seeks quiet times between 10pm to 6am so residents can sleep. No specific relief sought	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.79	Amend	Considers that Objective Noise-O1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing should be amended as this objective aims to protect amenity values and people's well-being from adverse noise levels, consistent with the nature of the receiving environment. This objective is generally supported as it reflects the outcomes anticipated from the management of noise under the RMA. However, rather than referring to 'adverse' noise levels, it is understood that the duty to avoid 'unreasonable' noise (section 16 of the RMA). An amendment to the objective to reflect this terminology is therefore proposed.	Amend Objective NOISE-O1 as follows:  Amenity values and peoples' health and wellbeing are protected from <del>adverse-unreasonable</del> noise-levels, particularly at night, consistent with the anticipated outcomes for the receiving environment.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O3: Reverse sensitivity	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.80	Support	Supports NOISE-O3: Reverse sensitivity as from Ravensdown's perspective, the continued effective operation of industrial activities, that are appropriately located in industrial zones (which tend to accommodate noisier activities), should not be constrained, or put at risk, by reverse sensitivity effects where more sensitive activities locate within industrial zones, or through the placement of residential zones immediately adjacent to industrial zones.	Retain Objective NOISE-O3 as notified in its entirety.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.81	Support	Supports Policy NOISE-P1: Amenity values, health and wellbeing as this policy is supported as it is appropriate to control noise levels throughout the city in a manner consistent with the activities provided for within different zones and the level of amenity anticipated. In addition, it is important to manage noise levels at the interface of different zones.	Retain Policy NOISE-P1 as notified.	Open Submission

# NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P2: Noise-sensitive activities	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.82	Support	Supports Policy NOISE-P2: Noise-sensitive activities as it articulates the key requirements for ensuring that the amenity anticipated by sensitive activities are provided for, and that reverse sensitivity effects do not arise for activities appropriately located in appropriate zones (e.g., industrial activities in industrial zones).	Retain Policy NOISE-P3 2 as notified.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general)	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.83	Support	Supports NOISE - Rules Table NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general) as Rule NOISE-R1A permits noise generation for all activities, unless Rules NOISE-R2 to NOISE-R8 apply, provided Standards NOISE-S1 and NOISE-S2 are complied with. Where the requirements of the permitted activity rule are not complied with, a restricted discretionary land use consent is required (Rule NOISE-R1B). As Rules NOISE-R2 to NOISE-R8 do not apply to Ravensdown's industrial activities in the city, this Rule does apply. As discussed below in relation to Standard NOISE-S1, the noise limits that apply in the GIZ, seem consistent with the noise limits applied to industrial zones throughout New Zealand. Given this context, the general noise framework provided for by this rule is supported.	Retain Rule NOISE-R1 as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R9: Noise sensitive activities in the City Centre Zone, Mixed Use Zone, or Industrial Zone	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.84	Amend	Considers NOISE-R9: Noise sensitive activities in the City Centre Zone, Mixed Use Zone, or Industrial Zone should be amended as while the rule framework of the GIZ chapter of the PDP makes it difficult for noise sensitive activities to establish in the zone (non-complying activity, under Rule GIZ-R7, for activities not provided for in the GIZ chapter), for the purposes of clearly managing potential reverse sensitivity effects, it is considered that this noise mitigation rule should also apply in industrial zone (as inferred by the rule title).	Amend Rule NOISE-R9 as follows:  NOISE-R9A  Activity Status: Permitted  Where:  1. Any new or altered noise sensitive space of any noise sensitive activity within the City Centre Zone, <del>or</del> Mixed Use Zone or Industrial Zones (Light and General) must be located, designed, or screened by suitable barriers on the property so that the internal noise levels in those rooms do not exceed: ...	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R20: Activities infringing standards NOISE-S1-S4	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.85	Support	Supports Rule NOISE-R20: Activities infringing standards NOISE-S1-S4 as although this rule possibly does not need to refer to Standards NOISE-S1 and NOISE-S2 (i.e., given that Rule NOISE-R1 applies a restricted discretionary activity status when the standards are not complied with), the rule is supported as it acts as a 'catch-all' rule.	Retain Rule NOISE-R20 as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S1: General noise limits	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.86	Support	Supports NOISE - Standards Table NOISE-S1: General noise limits as this standard sets the noise limits for the various zones within the city. The noise limits for the GIZ are 70dB LAeq(15min) all day and 85dB LAFmax between 10pm and 7am. These noise limits, based on Ravensdown's operations throughout New Zealand, seem consistent with the noise limits applied to industrial zones throughout New Zealand. For these reasons, the proposed noise limits are supported.	Retain Standard NOISE-S1 as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-I3: Noise-sensitive activities can impact on the operation of noise-generating activities	Leanne Roberts	257.48	Support	Considers it is important to recognise that reverse sensitivity effects need to be avoided.	Seeks to retain NOISE-I3.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O3: Reverse sensitivity	Leanne Roberts	257.49	Support	Considers it is important to recognise that reverse sensitivity effects need to be avoided.	Seeks to retain NOISE-O3.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing	Leanne Roberts	257.50	Amend	Considers it is important that the anticipated outcomes for the receiving environment are taken into account. For instance, the rural area is not a quiet area, even though some perceive it as such. There should be a policy that clearly provides for activities that generate noise.	Seeks to retain NOISE-O1 but include a new objective to provide for noise generating activities.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /General	Leanne Roberts	257.51	Amend	Amend to add a new objective to provide for activities that need to generate noise in the district.	Seeks to add new objective:  Recognise and provide for activities that generate noise whilst ensuring that the noise levels are compatible with the character and activities undertaken in the zone in which it occurs, which will vary across the district.	Open Submission

# NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Policies /General	Leanne Roberts	257.52	Amend	States a new policy is needed to provide for noise from primary production activities. This is needed to support NOISE-R1A 2a).	Seeks to include a new policy:  Provide for primary production activities which generate noise within the Rural Production Zone and ensure that they are not constrained from reverse sensitivity effects arising from noise sensitive activities located in the Rural Production Zone.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P2: Noise-sensitive activities	Leanne Roberts	257.53	Amend	States that the policy is focused on the noise sensitive activities not the activities that need to generate noise. It is unclear what would be included a high-noise generating activities in clause c).	Seeks to Clarify what is intended to be included as 'high noise generating activities'.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P4: Reverse sensitivity	Leanne Roberts	257.54	Amend	Considers the Rural Production Zone should be included in NOISE-P4.	Amend as follows:  <u>Added to NOISE-P4</u>  <u>d) Rural Production Zone</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general)	Leanne Roberts	257.55	Support	Supports the permitted activity in NOISE-R1A 2a) that provides for noise from horticultural activities.	Seeks to retain NOISE-R1A 2a).	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R5: Noise generated from rural production activities	Leanne Roberts	257.56	Amend	Considers Rural production activities are not defined in the Plan. States, the rule should refer to primary production activities.	Seeks to amend NOISE-R5 to Noise generated from primary production activities.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R5: Noise generated from rural production activities	Leanne Roberts	257.57	Amend	Supports the rules for audible bird scaring devices, Hail cannon, Gas guns, firearms, Audible avian distress alarms and frost protection fans. However, submitter states that the provision in 13 is inappropriate. Considers the condition should be that any noise sensitive activity establishing within 300m of an existing frost fan should have to provide acoustic insulation. A rule is sought in RPROZ to this effect.	Seeks to amend NOISE-R5A by deleting 13 and replacing with a rule requiring noise insulation for noise sensitive activities within 300m of a frost fan.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S1: General noise limits	Leanne Roberts	257.58	Support	Supports a daytime noise limit of 55db for the Rural Production Zone which recognises that the rural production zone is a noisier environment than the residential zone.	Seeks to retain a 55dB 7am – 7pm noise limit for the Rural Production Zone.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /NOISE-AC2: Noise generated from rural production activities not meeting the activity standards (NOISE-R5)	Leanne Roberts	257.59	Support	The assessment criteria for noise from rural production activities is supported.	Seeks to retain NOISE-AC2.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S1: General noise limits	Dominic McClarey	275.5	Oppose	Objects increased noise to 70db all night.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-I3: Noise-sensitive activities can impact on the operation of noise-generating activities	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.82	Support	Supports the recognition of reverse sensitivity through issue NOISE-I3. Notes that to encourage increased housing density and greater integration between land use and transport, in some instances sensitive activities will need to be acoustically treated to ensure they maintain internal amenity.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-I4: Increased residential activity in the City Centre and Mixed Use Zone (city centre fringe and Ahuriri) can lead to reverse sensitivity effects on the established noise-generating activities	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.83	Support	Supports the recognition of reverse sensitivity through issue NOISE-I4. Consider that where more intense land use is encouraged, particularly to drive the aspirations of the Spatial Picture, sensitive activities will need to be acoustically treated to ensure they maintain internal amenity. Managing reverse sensitivity effects will also support more intense integration and connectivity between land use and transport.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.84	Support	Considers that it is important that the district plan manages both compatible and non-compatible land uses. Considers that separation of non-compatible land use is the best solution however, where this is impractical, treatments need to be applied to ensure that sensitive receivers enjoy reasonable internal amenity while established activities are not compromised through reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O2: Vibrancy of the city centre and Ahuriri	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.85	Support	Considers it is important that the district plan manages both compatible and non-compatible land uses. Considers that the separation of non-compatible land use is the best solution, however, where this is impractical, treatments need to be applied to ensure that sensitive receivers enjoy reasonable internal amenity while established activities are not compromised through reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O3: Reverse sensitivity	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.86	Support	Considers it is important that the district plan manages both compatible and non-compatible land uses. Considers that the separation of non-compatible land use is the best solution, however, where this is impractical, treatments need to be applied to ensure that sensitive receivers enjoy reasonable internal amenity while established activities are not compromised through reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O5: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.87	Support	Considers it is important that the district plan manages both compatible and non-compatible land uses. Considers that the separation of non-compatible land use is the best solution, however, where this is impractical, treatments need to be applied to ensure that sensitive receivers enjoy reasonable internal amenity while established activities are not compromised through reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P5: Transport network	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.88	Amend	Seek to amend the policy to recognise the functional and operational requirements of maintaining, operating, and improving the state highway network. Subclause 'a' would impose an impractical restriction and narrow focus on the best practicable option for new and upgraded state highways. Submitter considers management of adverse noise effects, but notes this is just one in a range of considerations for the provision a safe and efficient transport network. Seeks for the deletion of subclause 'a' to remove the narrow outcome for the delivery of a safe and efficient transport network. Seek a minor amendment to subclause 'b.' as management of noise sensitive activities includes treatments beyond insulation as outlined in NZTA's submission on NOISE-R10 below. Seek to replace insulation with treatment to expand the directive of the policy to include the range of treatment available to manage for noise sensitive activities.	Amend NOISE-P5 as follows:  Minimise potential conflicts between noise generated from the transport network and noise sensitive activities by:  <del>Requiring the adoption of the best practicable option minimise the noise effects on all new and upgraded state highways, arterials, collector roads, and railways constructed in the city, and</del>  Requiring <del>insulation</del> treatment of new or altered noise sensitive activities where they are located near a High Land Transport Noise Overlay.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general)	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.89	Support	Support excluding vehicles traveling on public roads in this standard.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R6: Noise generated from new or altered roads	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.90	Support	Supports rule NOISE-R6 as it recognises NZS6806:2010 provides best practice guidance on mitigating road traffic noise for new and altered state highways.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R10: Noise sensitive activities in the High Land Transport Noise Overlay	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.91	Amend	Supports a rule aligning with their noise mitigation model provisions sought to be included in District Plans across New Zealand . Notes that Statehighway networks run 24/7, and train characteristics can change without community consultation. Noise can have an impact on the internal amenity of a building. Mitigation measures are essential to prevent adverse effects on the health and wellbeing of nearby residents and workers. Seeks a new rule and standard to ensure appropriate internal amenity in buildings for sensitive activities. This is most effectively achieved at the time of construction. The further removed from the rail corridor a building is, the less additional mitigation may be required. Mitigation levels are based on World Health Organisation standards, considering intermittent train noise and community acceptance. Notes requiring a greater setback from the state highway corridor as a means of addressing noise effects at smaller residential sites near the state highway corridor may not be feasible. Non-compliance requires consent as a restricted discretionary activity under the proposed plan. KiwiRail and NZTA seek to protect the safe and efficient operation of their respective transport networks, and the amenity of those who reside and work within proximity to transport corridors. Both collaborate to produce a refined rule and standard to manage noise-sensitive activities within the High Land Transport Noise Overlay. Both seek the same framework of controls in terms of managing noise effects, with some variation in criteria and distances between road and rail. The purpose of the provisions sought is to protect the health of occupants of new and altered buildings, and in turn to avoid or mitigate potential reverse sensitivity effects on the operations of KiwiRail and NZTA. Refer to original submission for full reasons and attached proposed rules, standards and Section 32 Report on Noise and Vibration	Replace NOISE-R10 with the rule and standard provided in Appendix 1. (Refer to original submission for attached proposed standard)  <u>NOISE-R10: Noise sensitive activities in the High Land Transport Noise Overlay</u> <u>NOISE-R10A</u> <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>Any new buildings or alterations to existing buildings containing an activity sensitive to noise which complies with the noise standards in</u> <u>NOISE-S7.</u> <u>NOISE-R10B</u> <u>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>Whether the activity sensitive to noise could be located further from the state highway or railway network.</u> <u>The extent to which the noise criteria are achieved and the effects of any non-compliance.</u> <u>The character of, and degree of, amenity provided by the existing environment and proposed activity.</u> <u>The reverse sensitivity effects on the state highway or rail network, and the extent to which mitigation measures can enable their ongoing operation, maintenance and upgrade.</u> <u>Special topographical, building features or ground conditions</u>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /NOISE-AC6: Noise sensitive activities in the High Land Transport Noise Overlay (NOISE-R10)	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.92	Amend	Notes if noise sensitive activities are designed in accordance with the permitted activity assessment criteria internal level will be considered reasonable. Seeks amendments to rephrase the criteria in a manner that assesses whether unreasonable noise levels resulting from not complying with the permitted activity standard are an acceptable compromise and appropriately managed.	Amend to redraft subclause a as follows:  <del>Whether the design, including location, methods, and construction techniques proposed, is likely to provide an internal noise environment that is likely to ensure that the internal noise levels are reasonable for the occupants and will avoid or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects on the transportation network</del>  <u>The design, including orientation, location and methods and construction techniques proposed provide an appropriate compromise to manage internal noise environments that avoid or mitigates reverse sensitivity effects on the transportation network.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise /General	Dionne Best	278.1	Amend	Submitter provides background and context for the Meeanee Speedway, located at Papakura Domain, Sandy Road, Meeanee, which has been a fixture since 1961, serving as the home of the Hawkes Bay Speedway club. Notes that the speedway operates consistently from October to May, with no intention of expansion but notes concerns about proposed restrictions in the District Plan. Considers that restrictions could negatively impact the viability of the club and the speedway's operation, potentially leading to its closure. Notes that the club has provided correct information to address potential noise issues but remains unclear about the reasoning behind the proposed limitations in the District Plan.	No specific relief sought. See additional submissions or original submission for full details.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R17: Noise generated by Meeanee Speedway	Dionne Best	278.2	Amend	Considers that the conditions for rule Noise-R17A could have significant negative impacts on the operation of the speed way. Considers that condition 5 does not accommodate for meetings in may which are weather dependent, and allows the Club to ensure it is able to meet its obligations around the number of events offered to each class across the season, and to allow for National and Regional Title events to be completed. Also considers the condition would also result in competitors preferring to contract to alternative out-of-town tracks – to see local competitors, their supporters, and many spectators travelling out of our region to race (rather than attracting visitors to our region), which would have a downward spiral effect on the long-term viability of Meeanee Speedway. Considers that condition 6(a) is inconsistent with the typical speedway season which would consist of around 20 pre-scheduled events or more (accounting for a National Title or other major event). Also considers that weather events/ rainouts may increase number of noise events that take place throughout the season. This restricts Meeanee Speedway to operating at a level less than it currently does. Considers that condition 6(b) does not accommodate for title events which run over two or three nights (it's not possible to run them in fewer nights), and are also typically held in January and February, which is also the busiest time on the racing calendar. Condition 6(b) has the effect of limiting the events Meeanee Speedway can host at the time such events are traditionally hosted, and reducing the operation of the track, to a level below that at which the track currently operates. Considers that this would compromise long-term viability. Considers that condition 6(c) fails allow Meeanee speedway to meet requirements set by Speedway New Zealand, to run a minimum of three practice events per season. Notes that common practice has been for practices to run for around three hours, and to be held	Amend condition 5 so that noise events and noise practice events are limited to the racing season (1 October to 31 May inclusive), so that Meeanee Speedway may continue operating as it currently does. Amend condition 6(a) to increase to 25 events per season (not including practice noise events) to enable Meeanee Speedway to continue to operate as it always has.  Amend condition 6(b) to make this requirement no more than five noise events in any 4-week period to more accurately reflect current practice, and more reasonably allow Meeanee Speedway to operate as it currently does. Amend condition 6(c). to allow for six three-hour practice events, to be run on any day of the week between the hours of 9am and 9pm, at any time throughout the season to accommodate what happens currently and meet obligations to Speedway New Zealand.  Amend condition 7 to allow for eight events to take place on days other than Saturday and amend to allow for a four hour window of scheduled racing starting any time between 4pm and 6pm, with a 45 minute allowance for overruns, and provision for races to be started during the 45 minute allowance if it were necessary to do so to complete an event.	Open Submission

# NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general)	Alec Duncan	288.56	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency supports NOISE-R1(2) that exempts the noise of sirens used for emergency purposes from the noise and vibration standards in any part of the District Plan and are therefore considered permitted activities.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency however seeks that this exception be extended to the use of generators and mobile equipment (including vehicles) for emergency purposes and activities at emergency service facilities associated with emergency response, re-commissioning and emergency response training.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>f. the noise of sirens, generators and mobile equipment (including vehicles) used for emergency purposes.</p> <p><u>g. Activities at emergency service facilities associated with emergency response, re-commissioning and temporary emergency services training.</u></p> <p>or similar effect.</p>	Open Submission



# SIGN - Signs

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SIGN - Signs /Objectives /	Kelby Cai	143.7	Support	Supports provisions which enable signage	To retain Objectives:  - SIGN-O1: Signs that meet the needs of the community and do not detract from the visual amenity of the area  - SIGN-O2: Well-designed and appropriately located signage enhances city vibrancy, ensures public and transport safety, and contributes to community wellbeing	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /Policies /	Kelby Cai	143.8	Amend	Considers that a specific policy and rules should be included in the Proposed Plan to regulate advertising signs which are integrated with network utilities in the road reserve. Considers the management approach in the Auckland Unitary Plan to be appropriate. Refer to original submission for further details.	To insert a new policy for 'signs integrated with network utilities'.  Insert a new policy  <u>SIGN-P12: Signs that are integrated with network utilities</u>  <u>Enable signs where they are an integrated component of network utilities</u>	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /SIGN - Signs - Rules Table /	Kelby Cai	143.9	Amend	Considers SIGN-R1 unclear in its intended application to official signs (the primary purpose of the Traffic Control Devices Manual) or to third party signs in the road reserve, noting the Traffic Control Devices Manual "Part 3" relates to advertising signs (including third-party signs). Seeks clarification as there are no other directly relevant provisions for advertising displays that are integrated with network utilities (such as street furniture).  Seeks specific provisions for third party digital signs in a road reserve to be a permitted activity subject to standards (including a specific set of policies, rules and standards). Considers the management approach in the Auckland Unitary Plan to be appropriate. Refer to original submission for further details.	Insert a new rule for 'signs that are integrated with network utilities'. Where a sign will not meet the permitted activity standards, such an activity should be provided for as a Restricted Discretionary activity. The matters of discretion that are appropriate are consistent with those that are otherwise included in other rules of the Proposed Plan for other types of signs that are a Restricted Discretionary activity.	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /SIGN - Signs - Rules Table	Sera Chambers	150.114	Amend	considers that the rule should be amended to include another condition for permitted activity status to protect the enjoyment of adjoining property rights as a guiding principle.	seeks to amend to add:  4. <u>the balloon must not impact the enjoyment of existing adjoining property owner rights as a guiding principles.</u>	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /Objectives /SIGN-O2: Well-designed and appropriately located signage enhances city vibrancy, ensures public and transport safety, and contributes to community wellbeing	Sheena McGuire	168.105	Support	Supports this objective which seeks to ensure transport safety	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /Policies /SIGN-P9: Control obstruction and hazards	Sheena McGuire	168.106	Support	Supports this policy which aims to ensure that signs don't obstruct, distract or cause nuisance to traffic, pedestrians, or the efficiency and safety of the transport network.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /SIGN - Signs - Standards Table	Sheena McGuire	168.107	Amend	Supports this standard but seeks a clause specifying that signs must not be located within the rail corridor.	Amend as follows:  1. All signs (other than a moveable, footpath sign) must be contained solely within the site boundaries.  2. Where a building has no verandah, the minimum vertical clearance to the base of any sign (other than a moveable, footpath sign) attached at right angles to the building facade from the footpath must be 2.5 m.  3. Signs must not be located on or over a road, including the road reserve, <u>or within the rail corridor.</u>  4. Signs must not obscure any important architectural feature of a heritage building (listed in the District Plan) including but not limited to windows, parapets, cornices, features or materials with a decorative pattern, and any other architectural elements that are a feature of the building.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SIGN - Signs /SIGN - Signs - Standards Table	Sheena McGuire	168.108	Amend	Supports this standard but seeks rail signals, safety and traffic to also be specified.	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All signs whether illuminated internally, externally or by other means:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. must not visually obstruct traffic control signals <u>or rail signals</u>, and</li> <li>b. must comply with the conditions relating to light spill in the condition table for the respective zone.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Lighting for the purpose of external illumination of signs must be securely attached to the verandah roof, building or sign and must be directed solely at the sign to be illuminated.</li> <li>3. The external illumination of signs by spotlights or floodlights shall be focused only on the device to be illuminated, and shall be directed away from residential zoned sites, <u>the rail corridor</u> and roads.</li> <li>4. The illuminated sign complies with the standards relating to lux light spill for the respective zone.</li> <li>5. Electronic signs, including digital signs must:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. not flash or contain moving images;</li> <li>b. not use animated or videos;</li> <li>c. not play music;</li> <li>d. not have sound or music;</li> <li>e. not obstruct or obscure any traffic control device <u>or rail signal</u> (including partially)</li> <li>f. not impair or obstruct the vision or view of any driver, motorists or any road or rail user using the road <u>or rail corridor</u> safely.</li> </ol> </li> <li>6. Digital images must:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. be static only;</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /SIGN - Signs - Rules Table /General	Mark Leggett	180.11	Oppose	<p>Opposes as it is not clear which SIGN rules apply to signs in the PORTZ Zone. Rules SIGN-R1 to SIGN-R8, SIGN-R10 to SIGN-R14, SIGN-R19, SIGN-R21, SIGN-R22, SIGN-R24 and SIGN-R25 specifically to signs in the road reserve, specific parks, certain precincts or zones, on certain buildings or in relation to specific activities, whereas as Rules SIGN- R9, SIGN-R15 to SIGN-R18, SIGN-R20 and SIGN-S23 apply in areas outside those specified. Rule SIGN-R26 acts as a non-complying activity default for signs not otherwise provided for. Notes assumption regarding applicability of Rules SIGN-R15 to SIGN-R18, particularly Rule SIGN-R15 regarding signs on building facades, in the PORTZ Zone. Notes that Standards SIGN-S1, SIGN-S2, and SIGN-S4 are likely applicable due to their reference to "All zones and precincts," but not Standard SIGN-S3, which does not mention the PORTZ Zone. Considers that an absence of any control on sign area in the PORTZ Zone is appropriate, if that is what is intended, submitter would be concerned if signs in the PORTZ Zone fell to non-complying status under Rule SIGN-R26 in the absence of specific references elsewhere.</p> <p>Seeks a review of the application of the SIGN provisions to the PORTZ Zone and make consequential amendments as necessary to clarify which provisions apply. Seeks that any SIGN provisions applying to the PORTZ Zone must reflect the workaday character and amenity of the area. In that context it is noted that, explicitly, no limitation on sign area or combination of signs per site applies in the industrial zone (SIGN-S3). Considers that a similar approach is warranted for the PORTZ Zone.</p>	<p><b>Review</b> the application of the SIGN provisions to the PORTZ Zone and consequentially <b>amend</b> the SIGN – Signs – Rules Table and SIGN – Signs – Standards Table as appropriate to provide clarity as to their application and so that, as a consequence, a similar approach is adopted as that that applies in industrial zones.</p>	Open Submission

# SIGN - Signs

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SIGN - Signs /SIGN - Signs - Standards Table /General	Mark Leggett	180.12	Oppose	<p>Opposes as it is not clear which SIGN rules apply to signs in the PORTZ Zone. Rules SIGN-R1 to SIGN-R8, SIGN-R10 to SIGN-R14, SIGN-R19, SIGN-R21, SIGN-R22, SIGN-R24 and SIGN-R25 specifically to signs in the road reserve, specific parks, certain precincts or zones, on certain buildings or in relation to specific activities, whereas as Rules SIGN- R9, SIGN-R15 to SIGN-R18, SIGN-R20 and SIGN-S23 apply in areas outside those specified. Rule SIGN-R26 acts as a non-complying activity default for signs not otherwise provided for. Notes assumption regarding applicability of Rules SIGN-R15 to SIGN-R18, particularly Rule SIGN-R15 regarding signs on building facades, in the PORTZ Zone. Notes that Standards SIGN-S1, SIGN-S2, and SIGN-S4 are likely applicable due to their reference to "All zones and precincts," but not Standard SIGN-S3, which does not mention the PORTZ Zone. Considers that an absence of any control on sign area in the PORTZ Zone is appropriate, if that is what is intended, submitter would be concerned if signs in the PORTZ Zone fell to non-complying status under Rule SIGN-R26 in the absence of specific references elsewhere.</p> <p>Seeks a review of the application of the SIGN provisions to the PORTZ Zone and make consequential amendments as necessary to clarify which provisions apply. Seeks that any SIGN provisions applying to the PORTZ Zone must reflect the workaday character and amenity of the area. In that context it is noted that, explicitly, no limitation on sign area or combination of signs per site applies in the industrial zone (SIGN-S3). Considers that a similar approach is warranted for the PORTZ Zone.</p>	<p><b>Review</b> the application of the SIGN provisions to the PORTZ Zone and consequentially <b>amend</b> the SIGN – Signs – Rules Table and SIGN – Signs – Standards Table as appropriate to provide clarity as to their application and so that, as a consequence, a similar approach is adopted as that that applies in industrial zones.</p>	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /SIGN - Signs - Rules Table	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.70	Amend	Stadium is incorrectly spelt in the rule heading. This is an error.	Correct spelling of "Stadium".	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /SIGN - Signs - Rules Table Activity Status where conditions and standards are not met: Restricted Discretionary  Matters of discretion are:  Any effects (including cumulative) of signs on the amenity values of the area; The effects on heritage values; Any hazard, safety risk, or obstruction to vehicular traffic or pedestrians; The impact on the appearance of the building; The design and appearance of the sign; The dimensions of the sign, and The duration of the sign placement	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.71	Amend	To assist plan users, reference to the Electoral Act 1993 is recommended as compliance with that act is also required in addition to the District Plan.	Add to the end of the rule: Note: Signs are also required to comply with the Electoral Act 1993 (or similar relief).	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /SIGN - Signs - Rules Table /	Amelia Longley	222.135	Support	Support rules that provide for Signs within the Stadium Zone	Retain SIGN-R10	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /SIGN - Signs - Rules Table	Amelia Longley	222.136	Support	Support rules that provide for Signs within the Stadium Zone.	Seeks to Retain SIGN-R11.	Open Submission

# SIGN - Signs

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SIGN - Signs /SIGN - Signs - Rules Table /	Amelia Longley	222.137	Amend	No rules provided for signs on parks and reserves (other than for flashing signs in the Sport and Active Recreation Zone) Sign are necessary for identification of parks and to convey information about what type of activities are acceptable / where facilities are etc.	<p>Insert new provisions s sought (or words to that effect) and provide/link to associated standards.</p> <p><u>SIGN-RxB</u>  <u>Activity Status where compliance not achieved:</u>  <u>RDIS</u>  <u>Matters over which discretion is limited:</u>  <u>1. The effects of non-compliance with any relevant Signs Standards and any relevant matters of discretion in the infringed effects standards.</u>  <u>2. The proposed duration of the display period.</u>  <u>3. Potential positive or adverse effects on the amenity values and character of the surrounding area.</u>  <u>4. Whether the sign would be in keeping with the built and natural features in the area and is visually appropriate in the area.</u>  <u>5. Whether the design and nature of the sign or support structure affects the potential impact of the sign.</u>  <u>6. Potential positive or adverse effects on road user and footpath user safety, including motorists, cyclists and pedestrians.</u>  <u>7. Whether the sign would combine with existing signage on the site or in the surrounding area, to create visual clutter.</u></p>	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /SIGN - Signs - Rules Table /	Amelia Longley	222.138	Amend	No provision for official signs in parks that are often required to convey legislative requirements such as health and safety legislation and public safety measures etc.	<p>Insert new provisions as sought (or words to that effect) and provide/link to associated standards.</p> <p><u>SIGN-Rx Official signs in Open Space and Recreation Zones</u></p> <p><u>Activity status: PERMITTED</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>1. . the sign is required to meet legislative requirements, such as health and safety legislation; or</u>  <u>2. the sign provides information or instruction relating to public safety, such as equipment use, property entrances or for security purposes, and is no larger than reasonably necessary to convey the information</u></p> <p><u>Activity status where compliance not achieved: CONTROLLED</u></p> <p><u>Matters over which control is reserved:</u>  <u>1. The location of the sign.</u>  <u>2. The size and height of the sign.</u></p>	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /SIGN - Signs - Standards Table	Amelia Longley	222.139	Amend	Amend to include sign area for all Open Space Zones. A maximum site area of 6m2 is consistent with current provisions in the Operative District Plan	<p>Amend as sought or words to that effect.</p> <p><u>SIGN S3: Sign Area</u></p> <p><u>Open Space (Sports and Active Recreation Zones)</u></p> <p><u>nbsp;</u></p> <p><u>1. The maximum area of a sign or combination of signs per site, must not exceed 6 m2.</u>  <u>2. This standard does not apply to signs that are orientated internally and not visible from off the site.</u></p> <p><u>Refer to Open Space Zone chapter</u></p>	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /SIGN - Signs - Standards Table	Amelia Longley	222.140	Oppose	0.3m2 is too small for open space zones which often cover large area and have multiple entrances/ exits. Amendment to standard above will provide for signage in a manner consistent with Operative Plan. There is no case for reducing the area of signage from the Operative District Plan Limits.	Seeks to Delete.	Open Submission

# SIGN - Signs

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SIGN - Signs /SIGN - Signs - Standards Table	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.87	Support	Supports Signs - Standards Table SIGN-S3: Sign area as it is acknowledged that various SIGN rules (e.g., Rule SIGN-R14 to SIGN-R17), and standards, may apply to any new signage that Ravensdown may intend to put up at its three sites in the city. An important consideration, for Ravensdown, in relation to signage rules is that industrial sites are not restricted, by these rules, from meeting their various health and safety signage obligations under other legislation (i.e., HSNO, Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 etc). For this reason, the fact that this standard specifies that there is no maximum area of signage within industrial zones, is supported.	Retain the no maximum area of signage, for industrial zones, as provided for by Standard SIGN-S3, as notified.	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /SIGN - Signs - Standards Table	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.88	Support	Supports SIGN-S4: Sign illumination Standard as this Standard outlines a range of requirements for ensuring that signage illumination, including lighting, does not result in light spillage or distraction. The proposed requirements are considered appropriate.	Retain Standard SIGN-S4 as notified.	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /Objectives /General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.164	Oppose	Opposes SIGN - Signs Objectives as despite SIGN Issues 3, 4 and 6 referring to the potential for signs to have an adverse effect on heritage values, neither of the 2 Objectives specified for this Section explicitly contain an objective of managing these effects. It is requested that SIGN-O4 and SIGN-O5 contained in the Draft District Plan, be reinstated into the Proposed District Plan. It is also recommended that the previously drafted Objective relating to Napier City Heritage Precinct, be extended to cover other heritage Precincts and Overlay areas.	Seeks to amend SIGN - Signs Objectives with the addition of new Objectives as follows:  <u>SIGN-O3: Signs on heritage buildings</u> <u>Signs located on heritage buildings complement the heritage values and architectural features</u>  <u>Relates to SIGN-I3 and SIGN-I4 and SIGN-I6</u>  <u>SIGN-O4: Heritage Precincts and Overlays Signage in the Heritage Precincts and Overlays provides for businesses' locational and promotional needs while contributing to heritage values and streetscapes</u>  <u>Relates to SIGN-I3 and SIGN-I6</u>	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /Policies /SIGN-P7: Ensure signs do not obscure or compromise significant values	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.165	Support	Supports Policy SIGN-P7: Ensure signs do not obscure or compromise significant values as they seek to appropriately manage signage in areas with historic value, including scheduled heritage buildings and the Napier City Heritage Precinct.	Retain Policy SIGN-P7: Ensure signs do not obscure or compromise significant values as notified.	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /Policies /SIGN-P10: Manage signs on heritage buildings	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.166	Support	Supports Policy SIGN-P10: Manage signs on heritage buildings as it seeks to appropriately manage signage in areas with historic value, including scheduled heritage buildings and the Napier City Heritage Precinct.	Retain Policy SIGN-P10: Manage signs on heritage buildings in its entirety as notified.	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /Policies /SIGN-P11: Napier City Heritage Precinct	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.167	Support	Supports Policy SIGN-P11: Napier City Heritage Precinct as it seeks to appropriately manage signage in areas with historic value, including scheduled heritage buildings and the Napier City Heritage Precinct.	Retain Policy SIGN-P11: Napier City Heritage Precinct as notified.	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /SIGN - Signs - Rules Table	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.168	Support	Supports SIGN - Rule SIGN-R2: Signs on the building facade (excluding the side wall) in the Napier City Heritage Precinct or on any scheduled heritage building as it seeks to control signage within the Napier City Heritage Precinct.	Retain SIGN - Rule SIGN-R2: Signs on the building facade (excluding the side wall) in the Napier City Heritage Precinct or on any scheduled heritage building as notified.	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /SIGN - Signs - Rules Table	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.169	Support	Supports Rule SIGN-R25: Any electronic, digital, flashing or animated sign (including revolving lights) in the Napier City Heritage Precinct as the general intent of this rule, to control digital and flashing signage in the Napier City Heritage Precinct is supported.	Retain Rule SIGN-R25: Any electronic, digital, flashing or animated sign (including revolving lights) in the Napier City Heritage Precinct as notified.	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /Issues /SIGN-I2: Signs can contribute to visual clutter and create a hazard or other nuisance for pedestrians and traffic	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.93	Support	Supports the issue recognising the adverse effects signage can have on the safety and efficiency of the transport network.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /Objectives /SIGN-O2: Well-designed and appropriately located signage enhances city vibrancy, ensures public and transport safety, and contributes to community wellbeing	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.94	Amend	Seeks amendments to provide for signage that does not compromise the safe and efficient operation of the transport network.	Amend the objective as follows:Different types of signs of an appropriate size, design and positioned at suitable locations contribute to a vibrant city, and safe community, <u>and do not compromise the safety or efficiency of the transport network.</u>	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /Policies /SIGN-P3: Manage signs outside of rural areas	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.95	Support	Supports the directive of the policy to limit third party signage in Rural Production and Rural Lifestyle zones and be clear in their purpose/ intended use.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /Policies /SIGN-P5: Signs do not result in visual clutter	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.96	Support	Supports the policy controlling visual clutter effects.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /Policies /SIGN-P6: Signs relate to the services or products at the site	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.97	Support	Supports limits on third party signage in rural areas, as it limits potential adverse visual and distraction effects for users of the state highway network.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /Policies /SIGN-P9: Control obstruction and hazards	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.98	Support	Supports the directive of the policy recognizing the adverse effects signage poses to the safety and efficiency of the transport network.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

# SIGN - Signs

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SIGN - Signs /SIGN - Signs - Rules Table	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.99	Support	Supports the permitted status of Official Signs as it provides for the safe and efficient operation of the transport network.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /SIGN - Signs - Rules Table	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.100	Amend	<p>Considers amendments to this rule to appropriately control adverse effects resulting from sign distraction and sign proliferation and the associated effects on the transport network. Submitter's proposed amendments ensure the safety of the transport network and all transport network users, is required in accordance with SIGN-I2. Supports expanding the rule to include any signs fronting, facing or visible from the state highway network, to ensure adverse effects are appropriately identified and managed, consistent with relevant NZTA signage guidance (Traffic Controls Device Manual and Planning Policy Manual: Third Party Signs on and visible from the state highway corridor) to ensure that the safety of the state highway network is not compromised as a result of signage.</p> <p>Notes that NZTA has identified signs that are considered to have acceptable effects on the safety and efficiency of the transport network and that these meet the appropriate standards. Each sign that does not align with the standards outlined in this rule should be assessed on its merits and suitability to face the state highway to ensure signs do not increase the distraction for users of the transport network (and therefore safety) and proliferation of signs resulting in visual clutter.</p> <p>Supports managing the effects of Digital Signage in order to maintain transport safety, and do not support a permitted activity status for illuminated sign visible from the state highway network.</p>	<p>Amend SIGN-R14A as follows:  <u>Signs located on land adjacent to state highways outside of 50km/h speed limit fronting, facing or visible from a state highway</u>                      Activity Status- Permitted                      Where:                      Signs directed towards the state highways shall have a minimum lettering of 120 mm in areas up to 70km/h speed limit and 160mm in areas above 70km/h speed limit; and  <u>Signs have a maximum of 6 words and/ or symbols, with a maximum of 40 characters; and</u>  <u>Signs must not obstruct the movement of any pedestrian, motorist, or cyclist; and</u>  <u>Signs must not be made of materials likely to reflect headlights from an approaching vehicle; and</u>  <u>The activity is not illuminated and used for the purpose of</u>  <u>Interpretation sign;</u>  <u>Official sign</u>  <u>Directional sign;</u>  <u>Real estate sign;</u>  <u>Railway and traffic signs;</u>  <u>Election signs;</u>  <u>Temporary signs;</u>  <u>Veranda signs;</u>  <u>Real estate signs; or</u>  <u>Infrastructure signs; and</u>  <u>Compliance is activated with:</u></p>	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /SIGN - Signs - Rules Table	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.101	Amend	Supports the management of digital, electronic, flashing or animated signs, as these activities have the potential to create adverse visual and distraction effects with the potential to compromise the safety and efficiency of the transport network. Notes the rule as currently drafted sets an overly permissive activity status for illuminated signs with short dwell times and limited management of the signs content. Support amendments to SIGN-S4 and amendments to the matters of control to complement the amendments to the standard. Recommends amendments to the rules of the chapter to widen the assessment of effects to users of the transport network to encompass alternative transport modes.	<p>Amend SIGN-R21B as follows:                      Activity status where condition b and standards are not meet: restricted discretionary                      Matters of discretion are:                      [...]</p> <p><del>6. Any hazard, safety risk, or obstruction to motor vehicles, vehicular traffic or pedestrians with the potential to adversely affect any users of the transport network;</del>  <u>7. where fronting, facing or visible from a state highway the outcome of consultation with NZTA New Zealand Transport Agency for signs visible from the state highway network.</u></p>	Open Submission
SIGN - Signs /SIGN - Signs - Rules Table	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.102	Support	Supports a discretionary activity status for electronic, flashing or animated signs, as these signs create adverse visual and distraction effects with the potential to compromise the safety and efficiency of the transport network.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SIGN - Signs /SIGN - Signs - Standards Table	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.103	Amend	<p>Supports managing the effects of Digital Signage to maintain transport safety. Considers that digital signs can compromise safety or cause confusion with road signs, necessitating control over size, design, location, and management. Additional considerations are recommended for digital signs visible from the state highway network. Considers a 8 second dwell time is very short as drivers should not see an image change, with a maximum of 5% of drivers only seeing one image change. Multiple image changes can cause a distraction and increase driver’s risk. In the event that a dwell time cannot be determined, the dwell time should be no less than 30 seconds. SIGN-S4 does not include any criteria on image content. Restrictions on image content are proposed to minimize driver distraction. Therefore, considers that SIGN-S4 needs to be amended to include criteria for image content.Supports a minimum transition time of 0.5 seconds to avoid instant transitions. Supports the insertion of a clause to ensure no illuminated signage is visible from the state highway network as drafted in SIGN-R14. Supports a provision giving councils discretion to consider adverse effects on transport safety, seeking minor wording amendments for broader consideration.To ensure that signage does not compromise the safety of the state highway network, considers that an additional matter of discretion is required to ensure consultation is undertaken with Waka Kotahi for signage that is visible from the state highway network.</p>	<p>Amend SIGN-S4 as follows:</p> <p>Additional matters for digital signs visible from the State Highway</p> <p><u>7. There shall be a maximum of one digital sign per site;</u></p> <p><u>8. There shall be a transition time of no more than 1 second and no less than 0.5 seconds between each image or display. Images should ‘dissolve’ rather than be an abrupt change.</u></p> <p><u>9. The dwell time must not exceed the greater of 30 seconds or the dwell time required to ensure that no more than 5% of road users view a change in the image or display while using the portion of the state highway network from which the digital billboard is visible;</u></p> <p><u>10. In low-speed environments (70 km/h and less) at all times the digital billboard should include no more than ten individual elements; of which words may only make up eight elements. Additionally, each line of text shall contain a maximum of 40 characters.</u></p> <p><u>11. In higher speed environments (more than 70 km/h) these content controls halve. At all times the digital billboard should include no more than five individual elements; of which words may only make up four elements. Additionally, each line of text shall contain a maximum of 20 characters.</u></p> <p><u>12. The digital sign shall be operated with a fail-safe feature where in the event of a malfunction, the images or messages will be replaced by a solid black colour until the malfunction is resolved; [...]</u></p> <p>Matters of Discretion are: [...]</p> <p><u>8. The extent to which the sign may adversely affect the safe, efficient and effective operation of the transport network, as well as any hazard Any hazard, safety risk or obstruction to motor vehicles, vehicular traffic, or pedestrian</u></p> <p><u>9 .Outcome of consultation with New Zealand Transport Agency for signs visible from the state highway network.</u></p>	Open Submission

# TEMP - Temporary Activities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TEMP - Temporary Activities /TEMP - Temporary Activities - Rules Table	Sera Chambers	150.144	Amend	amend on the basis that adjoining landowners should have to be notified and be given the opportunity to have their say on temporary structures to allow the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment, especially where the temporary buildings or structures ancillary to construction activity being installed next to an affected landowners property are going to be in place for 12 months.	seeks to amend on the basis that adjoining landowners should have to be notified and be given the opportunity to have their say on temporary structures.	Open Submission
TEMP - Temporary Activities /TEMP - Temporary Activities - Rules Table	Sera Chambers	150.145	Amend	Amend on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Rule require notice to be provided to Council at least five working days prior to the commencement of the activity but there is no mention of how often the training will occur or how the adjoining landowner should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment e.g. helicopter landing and temporary military activities/weapons being fired.	Seeks to amend so that where possible temporary military training should be completed outside of residential areas, especially with weapons firing and/or the use of explosives (rules currently allow in close proximity - 500m to 1,250m) and landowners should be notified and be able to have their say to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment e.g. helicopter landing and temporary military activities/weapons being fired.	Open Submission
TEMP - Temporary Activities /TEMP - Temporary Activities - Rules Table	Cameron Drury	170.6	Amend	Considers that a stage should remain in place at the Church Road concert venue where multiple concerts may occur in short succession to avoid costs and nuisance disruption of packing out just to pack in again within a short period of time.	Amend <b>TEMP-R2A</b> 2. to allow a stage to remain erected on Section SO 9752 for a period of 35 days provided no more than three additional events occur outside this period.	Open Submission
TEMP - Temporary Activities /TEMP - Temporary Activities - Rules Table /TEMP-R2: Temporary noise events	Cameron Drury	170.7	Amend	Considers that it would better enable Temporary Activities to avoid the need for resource consent in relation to height infringements where the status will be temporary and height in relation to boundary controls are still met in respect to shading effects.	Delete the need for all associated buildings and structures (particularly stages) to comply with the height standards in the applicable zone.	Open Submission
TEMP - Temporary Activities /TEMP - Temporary Activities - Rules Table	Amelia Longley	222.128	Amend	<p>Clarify how clause R2A(1) of this rule relates to the rules and standards in the STADZ Zone (in particular rule STADZ-R4 and standards STADZ-R6) and amend to provide an integrated rule framework.</p> <p>Clarify the number of noise events for the Stadium. Six or ten and ensure provisions are consistent. Amend the number of events to be consistent (i.e. if the intention of the rules is that they apply to the same type of activities and is not to provide for six entertainment activities and 10 non-sporting temporary events).</p> <p>Use consistent terminology (sporting events / entertainment events /temporary noise events) and provide associated definitions where this clarify how to apply the rules.</p> <p>Condition 1(b) as the way it is currently worded is extremely permissive and would potentially allow for events running up to 270 days per year in the Marine Parade Recreation Contril Area, the Open Space Zone - coastal environment and Anderson Park.</p>	<p>Amend rule to clarify relationship to Rule STADZ -R4 and Standard STADZ-S6. Amend rule to clarify number of temporary noise events for the stadium zone. Amend condition 1(b) as sought (or words to that effect).</p> <p>Amend matter of discretion R2B(2) as sought.</p> <p><b>TEMP-R2A</b>  <b>Activity Status:</b> Permitted  Where:  1. The number of temporary noise events that may occur on any one site in a calendar year must not exceed five except that:  a. In the Stadium Zone, there is no restriction on the number of sporting events (subject to Rule STADZ-R2). Up to <del>ten</del> <b>six</b> non-sporting temporary noise events shall be permitted per calendar year within the Stadium Zone, and  b. Up to 18 temporary noise events shall be permitted per calendar year per site in the Marine Parade Recreation Control area, the Open Space Zone – coastal environment, and in Anderson Park provided that the maximum duration of <u>individual</u> temporary noise events within each area shall be <del>15</del> <b>no more than:</b>  i. 24 hours for concerts/entertainment  ii. 5 consecutive days for a sporting event; or  iii. 3 days for all other temporary activities under this rule.</p> <p><b>TEMP-R2B</b>  <b>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met:</b> Restricted Discretionary  Matters of discretion are:</p>	Open Submission
TEMP - Temporary Activities /Objectives	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.89	Support	Supports Objective TEMP-O2: Adverse effects arising from temporary buildings and structures that enable construction as recognising that temporary buildings and structures are associated with construction activities, while ensuring that such buildings and structures are managed so as to minimise effects beyond the construction areas, is an appropriate planning approach.	Retain Objective TEMP-O2 as notified.	Open Submission



# TEMP - Temporary Activities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TEMP - Temporary Activities /Policies /TEMP-P1: Enabling temporary activities	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.90	Support	Supports Policy TEMP-P1: Enabling temporary activities as providing for, or enabling, construction activities within the city provides for city's ongoing development, redevelopment and thus economic viability and vibrancy.	Retain Policy TEMP-P1 as notified.	Open Submission
TEMP - Temporary Activities /Policies /TEMP-P2: Adverse effects arising from temporary activities	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.91	Support	Supports Policy TEMP-P2: Adverse effects arising from temporary activities as outlined above in relation to Policy TEMP-P1, enabling and providing for construction activities in the city has positive effects of the city. However, it is also acknowledged that it is important that the potential adverse effects associated with construction activities are appropriately managed.	Retain Policy TEMP-P2 as notified.	Open Submission
TEMP - Temporary Activities /TEMP - Temporary Activities - Rules Table	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.92	Amend	<p>Considers Temporary Activities - Rules Table TEMP-R1A: Temporary buildings and structures ancillary to construction activity should be amended as while the intent of the permitted activity rule restrictions is supported, there are issues with aspects of these restrictions, particularly larger, and thus longer term, construction activities. The issues relate the proposed 50m2 gross floor area restriction and the proposed 12-month permitted activity timeframe for construction activities. In relation to the area restriction under Condition 1(b), it is considered that a total gross floor area of 50m2 for ancillary temporary buildings and structures, particularly for large scale projects, is very small. In addition, the restriction is not required given the complementary restrictions provided in Conditions (1)(a) and (c).</p> <p>Condition (2) requires temporary buildings or structures associated with construction activities to be removed, either one month after the completion of the construction activity, or 12 months after they were placed on site, whichever is the lesser. In effect, given that ancillary buildings and structures are often the first things established at a construction site (and the last to be removed), this condition effectively restricts permitted construction activities to 12 months. This timeframe does not reflect the timeframes associated with larger, or more complex construction activities, nor does it accommodate restrictions that may be associated with the colder months of year, or weather slowing down construction activities. For this reason, a longer permitted activity construction period of 18 months is proposed.</p>	<p>Amend Rule TEMP-R1A as follows:</p> <p>TEMP-R1A</p> <p>Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The temporary building or structure: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is for such purposes as a temporary office, storage shed, storage yard, builders' workshop, safety fence, and other similar buildings and uses of land that are incidental to a construction project;</li> <li><del>is no more than 50 m2 in gross floor area, and</del></li> <li>complies with the yards, height, and height in relation to boundary standards in the applicable zone.</li> </ol> </li> <li>The temporary building or structure is removed within one month of the completion of the construction project or within 182 months from when it was first placed on the site, whichever is the lesser.</li> <li>The noise and vibration limits in NOISE-R2 – Construction noise and vibration apply.</li> </ol>	Open Submission
TEMP - Temporary Activities /General /General	Trevor Ellis	253.80	Amend	<p>The submitter considers that temporary activities can occur in the Open Space Zone and the Natural Open Space Zones. There are currently no objectives or policies in the TEMP chapter that provide for restrictions on managing events in the environments despite the sensitivity that those environments can have depending on the time of year due to flora and fauna.</p> <p>Considers that explicit mention of managing effects on indigenous and migratory indigenous biodiversity, habitats, and ecosystems is needed to ensure that the NPS-IB is implemented.</p> <p>The Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter is yet to be implemented, which would likely assist the TEMP chapter, but measures need to be inserted now to ensure that indigenous biodiversity is not harmed in the interim.</p>	<p>Seeks to amend the chapter to include new objectives and policies that provide for the protection of indigenous biodiversity during temporary events in line with the effects management hierarchy or NZCPS Policy 11.</p> <p>Amend TEMP-O1 and TEMP-P1 to refer to impacts on not only established activities, but also on natural resources.</p> <p>And Amend matters of discretion in TEMP-R1B, 2B, and 3B to include the consideration of indigenous biodiversity.</p>	Open Submission
TEMP - Temporary Activities /Objectives /TEMP-O1: Adverse effects arising from temporary activities	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.104	Support	Supports objectives TEMP-O1 and TEMP-O2 as they recognise the need for temporary activities, including for construction.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
TEMP - Temporary Activities /Objectives /TEMP-O2: Adverse effects arising from temporary buildings and structures that enable construction	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.105	Support	Supports objectives TEMP-O1 and TEMP-O2 as they recognise the need for temporary activities, including for construction.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

# TEMP - Temporary Activities

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TEMP - Temporary Activities /Objectives /General	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.106	Amend	Seeks for Council to insert a new objective to ensure that temporary events do not compromise the safe and efficient operation of the land transport network. Notes that because state highways move traffic often at higher speeds, attention needs to be applied to traffic when operating temporary events that have access to a state highway. Recommends a new objective TEMP-O5 as relief sought.	Insert new objective as follows:  <b><u>TEMP-O5: Traffic Safety</u></b>  <u>Temporary activities are sufficiently managed to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the land transport network</u>	Open Submission
TEMP - Temporary Activities /Policies /TEMP-P4: Adverse effects arising from temporary activities on the transport network	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.107	Support	Supports P4 as it seeks to manage the effects of temporary activities on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
TEMP - Temporary Activities /TEMP - Temporary Activities - Rules Table /TEMP-R1: Temporary buildings and structures ancillary to construction activity	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.108	Amend	Supports rule TEMP-R1 however, the rule as drafted does not ensure any temporary construction on land located adjacent to a state highway will appropriately manage traffic effects.	Amend as follows:  <b><u>NOTES:</u></b> <u>1. Approval from the NZ Transport Agency may be necessary for temporary construction activities located within or on land adjacent to the state highway road reserve.</u>	Open Submission
TEMP - Temporary Activities /TEMP - Temporary Activities - Rules Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.57	Amend	In order to ensure an efficient and effective emergency response, firefighter training is an essential activity undertaken by Fire and Emergency. Firefighter training may include live fire training (i.e., burning and putting out fires) and equipment training both on and off site. The annual Statement of Performance Expectations (SPE) confirms a commitment to the Government that all firefighters achieve a certain level of training. District Plans should not prevent Fire and Emergency training activities from being carried out.  Fire and Emergency seeks provisions for emergency services training activities as permitted activities across all zones in order to better achieve the sustainable management purpose of the RMA and better enable Fire and Emergency to achieve its statutory function by facilitating firefighting and emergency response (including training for such circumstances).	Add a new rule as follows:  <b><u>TEMP-R4: Temporary emergency services training activities</u></b>  <u>All Zones</u>  <u>Activity Status: PER</u>	Open Submission

# GRZ - General Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Sharon Rose	9.1	Oppose	Opposes the low fencing height and the open top on them, and questions whether the new standard would apply to replacement fences. Concerned that lower/more open fences would seriously impact their enjoyment of their gardens/property, people and their pets, and quality of life generally	Seeks to remove or amend this clause so that all fences that border neighbours properties can be a solid 2 metres in height	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Sara Stephenson	11.1	Oppose	Opposes decrease in fence heights. Believes they should be able to have a 1.8m fence.	Change standard to set maximum height to 1.8m.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Emma Sey	12.1	Oppose	Submitter wants property to be fully-fenced and secure to a minimum height of 1.8m around the full boundary. To keep future dogs and children safe beyond doubt, without the need for keeping any dog/s restrained in another way.  It's also for privacy purposes. submitter's property sits up a slope, having a fence shorter than 1.8m wouldn't provide any privacy.	To leave 5.25 as it currently stands - "any fence erected within front, side and rear yards must not exceed 2 metres in height"	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Alyce Kelly	14.1	Oppose	Council should not force homeowners to build low or partly see through fences.	Do not lower fence heights or introduce standards around fences being visually open.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	gavin milley	15.1	Oppose	Oppose height restrictions on fencing. Height should be at the owner's discretion.	No fence height restriction standard.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Dave Rountree	17.1	Oppose	Opposes fence height restrictions as a high fence provides privacy and security to homeowners, particularly for those who only have liveable outdoor space at the front of their home. 1.2m is not high enough to secure dogs and is easily scalable to commit crime. Leaving the height as existing in the ODP will still allow those who prefer a 1.2m fence to build their fence at this height should they choose to do so.	Retain the current fence height restrictions in the Operative District Plan	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Sarah Cotter	18.2	Oppose	Opposes GRZ fence restrictions in place	Delete GRZ fence height restrictions	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Michael Boyle	20.1	Oppose	The submitter considers that the 1.2m height for fences or walls (or a combination of these structures) is too low.	Seeks that GRZ-S8 (Fences and Walls) 1.a. i. allow for 1.8m in height and that 50% boundary length and visual permeability Standards be deleted.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Marg and Nicole Fleischi	22.1	Oppose	The submitter considers that the 1.2m height for fences or walls (or a combination of these structures) is too low.	Seeks deletion of the GRZ-S8 (Fences and Walls) 1.a. 1.2m height limit.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	KARL GOODCHILD	23.1	Oppose	Considers that the 1.2m height for fences or walls (or a combination of the structures) is too low and has implications for dog owners	Seeks that the GRZ-S8 (Fences and Walls) 1.a. 1.2m height limit is not included in the Proposed District Plan.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Susan Dallas	25.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Ashley Hampton	26.1	Oppose	The submitter considers that the 1.2m height for fences or walls (or a combination of these structures) is too low.	Seeks deletion of the GRZ-S8 (Fences and Walls) 1.a. 1.2m height limit.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.1	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential /	Lynda Otter	44.2	Amend	Considers that any dwelling 2 or more storeys will overlook single storey houses. Therefore, written approval should be required if development overlooks single storey homes.	Seeks that neighbour's approval is required for any 2 storey plus development next to a single storey site through an amendment to the PDP GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	David Brokken	46.1	Oppose	The submitter considers that the 1.2m height for fences or walls (or a combination of these structures) is too low.	Seeks deletion of the GRZ-S8 (Fences and Walls) 1.a.i. 1.2m height limit and that Noise-R10: Noise Sensitive Activities in the High Land Transport Noise Overlay does not include noise barrier screening along the Hawke's Bay Expressway.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Peter Grant	78.7	Support	Supports the proposed standards for fences and walls. Safety and visibility from and to the street are important for older people, particularly for those living alone. Social connections within neighbourhoods are important and lower fence heights go some way towards achieving this. Passive surveillance of the streetscape also helps with crime prevention. Comments also apply to MRZ-S8, HRZ-S8, and LLRZ-S8.	Amend to incorporate design guidelines to ensure utilisation of appropriate fence design and products.	Open Submission

# GRZ - General Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Issues /GRZ-I4: Non residential activities	Paul O'Shaughnessy	80.1	Oppose	Considers the historical and current use of 1 Creagh St to justify rezoning from General Residential Zone to Neighbourhood Centre Zone. Considers the value of the site as community hub for local residents and is well located to service the needs of several nearby schools. States that an upgrade is now required.	Seeks amendment for rezoning of 1 Creagh Street, to Neighbourhood Centre Zone given its nature, scale and its location within an existing residential catchment. Considers the proximity of Te Awa development Area and the contribution to community quality and access to local amenities. Considers the purpose of NCZ to apply due to its long-standing existing commercial use (i.e. retail and ancillary uses-storage, parking). Considers the provisions of NCZ to anticipate location within a suburban environment, therefore bulk and location controls suffice to manage future development. Considers the rezoning consistent with the hierarchy for centre zones established in the PDP and the Napier City Retail Strategy.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Issues /GRZ-I4: Non residential activities	Paul O'Shaughnessy	81.1	Oppose	Opposes the proposed zoning of 336, 337, 338, and 340 Meeanee Road as Rural Production Zone. Instead seeks these properties to be zoned Neighbourhood Centre Zone to reflect the established activities in this environment (small-scale commercial and community activities).	Amend the zoning of 336, 337, 338, and 340 Meeanee Road to Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Issues /	Summerset Group Holdings Limited Summerset Group Holdings Limited	103.1	Amend	<p>The demand for retirement village accommodation outstrips supply. The release of family homes back into the housing market annually through new retirement village builds represents a significant contribution to easing the chronic housing shortage.</p> <p>Considers that the PDP could better align with NPSUD in providing for a range of housing types, including the specific needs of older persons in a way which is more enabling, relative to the characteristics and requirements of retirement village activities through intensification in the existing urban environment. Also considers that the PDP could provide opportunity for such development/activity through rezoning by identifying greenfield land that is suitable for urban development by providing for a 'Future Urban Zone' framework.</p> <p>Refer to original submission for full reasons in attachment</p>	<p>Refer to original submission for full reasons in attachment</p> <p>No specific relief stated.</p>	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Objectives /	Summerset Group Holdings Limited Summerset Group Holdings Limited	103.2	Amend	<p>Considers that the PDP could better align with NPSUD in providing for a range of housing types, including the specific needs of older persons in a way which is more enabling, relative to the characteristics and requirements of retirement village activities through intensification in the existing urban environment. Also considers that the PDP could provide opportunity for such development/activity through rezoning by identifying greenfield land that is suitable for urban development by providing for a 'Future Urban Zone' framework.</p> <p>Considers that the provisions fail to appropriately distinguish and recognise the functional and operational attributes of retirement villages</p>	Add retirement-village specific objective, policy and rule framework for each of the residential zones to better address the NPSUD to enable the provision of a diverse range of retirement housing and care options in the District.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Policies /	Summerset Group Holdings Limited Summerset Group Holdings Limited	103.3	Amend	<p>Considers that the PDP could better align with NPSUD in providing for a range of housing types, including the specific needs of older persons in a way which is more enabling, relative to the characteristics and requirements of retirement village activities through intensification in the existing urban environment. Also considers that the PDP could provide opportunity for such development/activity through rezoning by identifying greenfield land that is suitable for urban development by providing for a 'Future Urban Zone' framework.</p> <p>Considers that the provisions fail to appropriately distinguish and recognise the functional and operational attributes of retirement villages</p> <p>Refer to original submission for full reasons in attachment</p>	Add retirement-village specific objective, policy and rule framework for each of the residential zones to better address the NPSUD to enable the provision of a diverse range of retirement housing and care options in the District.	Open Submission

# GRZ - General Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table /	Summerset Group Holdings Limited Summerset Group Holdings Limited	103.4	Amend	<p>Considers the proposed standards inappropriate for residential villages considering the provision of communal amenities.</p> <p>Residential outlook space;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum residential unit size;</li> <li>• Outdoor living space;</li> <li>• Windows to the street;</li> <li>• Landscaped area;</li> <li>• Maximum building length.</li> </ul>	<p>Seeks deletion of application of the following standards for retirement villages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential outlook space;</li> <li>• Minimum residential unit size;</li> <li>• Outdoor living space;</li> <li>• Windows to the street;</li> <li>• Landscaped area;</li> <li>• Maximum building length.</li> </ul> <p>Seeks amendment to provide specific standards and specific assessment framework for retirement villages which consider the location of this activity on large sites allow for amenities different to that os standard residential dwelling.</p>	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Assessment criteria /GRZ-AC1: Residential units (GRZ-R1); Minor residential units (GRZ-R3); Relocated buildings (GRZ-R9); Retirement village premises (GRZ-R10)	Summerset Group Holdings Limited Summerset Group Holdings Limited	103.5	Amend	<p>Considers it inappropriate for retirement villages to be subject to the same assessment matters/criteria as general residential developments, which exceed one unit per site, or for retirement villages to be subject to the same 'standards' that apply to residential units.</p>	<p>Seeks amendment to provide specific standards and specific assessment framework for retirement villages which also consider the location of this activity on large sites allow for amenities different to that of a standard residential dwelling.</p>	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Rules Table	Summerset Group Holdings Limited Summerset Group Holdings Limited	103.6	Amend	<p>Supports the restricted discretionary activity classification for 'Retirement village premises' in the General Residential Zone.</p> <p>Considers that the PDP could better align with NPSUD in providing for a range of housing types, including the specific needs of older persons in a way which is more enabling, relative to the characteristics and requirements of retirement village activities through intensification in the existing urban environment. Also considers that the PDP could provide opportunity for such development/activity through rezoning by identifying greenfield land that is suitable for urban development by providing for a 'Future Urban Zone' framework.</p> <p>Refer to original submission for full reasons in attachment</p>	<p>Seeks retirement village activities are precluded from being notified on a public or limited basis.</p>	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Introduction /	Summerset Group Holdings Limited Summerset Group Holdings Limited	103.13	Amend	<p>Considers that the introduction does not acknowledge the retirement villages significant accommodation/housing typology that contributes to the provision of a diverse range of housing demands, community wellbeing, and service freeing up land vacated by the elderly population when moving into a retirement village .</p> <p>Considers that the PDP could better align with NPSUD in providing for a range of housing types, including the specific needs of older persons in a way which is more enabling, relative to the characteristics and requirements of retirement village activities through intensification in the existing urban environment. Also considers that the PDP could provide opportunity for such development/activity through rezoning by identifying greenfield land that is suitable for urban development by providing for a 'Future Urban Zone' framework.</p>	<p>No specific relief stated. To add retirement-village specific objective, policy and rule framework for each of the residential zones to better address the NPSUD to enable the provision of a diverse range of retirement housing and care options in the District [Inferred Relief]</p> <p>Refer to full submission attachment for reasons.</p>	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Rules Table	Andrea Millar	105.10	Support	<p>Supports the permitted activity rules applying to "residential units" and "residential activity" in the zone as appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided by Ara Poutama.</p>	<p>Retain permitted activity rule GRZ-R1 applying to "residential units" and "residential activity" in the General Residential Zone.</p>	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Cameron Drury	128.20	Oppose	<p>Compromises variety in design – risks straight facades with no modulation.</p>	<p>Consider the best tool to achieve the outcome sought and make provision for narrow lots. This may include deleting the standard and relying on assessment criteria for multi-unit developments, or amendments to the standard.</p>	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Cameron Drury	128.21	Oppose	<p>May affect energy efficiency.</p>	<p>Consider the best tool to achieve the outcome sought and make provision for narrow lots.</p>	Open Submission

# GRZ - General Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Rules Table	Pip Beachen	142.4	Support	Supports the retention of a Restricted Discretionary Activity Status where activity conditions are not met, including new houses on small vacant sites and/or multiple residential units on a site. Also support the default non-notification for applications under this rule on both a public and limited basis.	Retain GRZ-R1.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Assessment criteria /GRZ-AC1: Residential units (GRZ-R1); Minor residential units (GRZ-R3); Relocated buildings (GRZ-R9); Retirement village premises (GRZ-R10)	Pip Beachen	142.5	Oppose	<p>Opposes Assessment Criteria matters GRZ-AC1(c), (g) and (s) where an assessment of the development's consistency with the Hastings Residential Intensification Design Guide (the <b>Design Guide</b>) is required. Considers that this is both onerous on top of the already extensive assessment criteria proposed for the General Residential Zone and introduces a level of subjectivity when considering an application against the Design Guide, both of which increase cost and uncertainty to any resource consent application. The proposed list of assessment criteria are already considered to cover a number of the matters outlined in the Design Guide and requiring applications to make an assessment against the 60 page Design Guide documents introduces additional cost to developers by way of additional assessment for both the applicant Planners and Council Planners and Urban Design teams.</p> <p>Considers that through requiring an assessment of this document introduces a layer of subjectivity to the consenting process increasing uncertainty. Seeks that the use of the Hastings Intensification Design Guide is as a non-statutory guidance document only and the use of this as a statutory assessment process is not supported.</p>	Delete Assessment Criteria matters GRZ-AC1(c), (g) and (s). Retain the remaining assessment criteria (a), (b), (d) – (f), (h) – (r) and (t).	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Pip Beachen	142.12	Support	Supports the standards of the General Residential Zone, Medium Density Residential Zone, and the High Density Residential Zone, except where otherwise stated through specific submission points. Considers that it is important that the standards appropriately facilitate the outcomes sought by Council for the City and further enable efficient development of sites while achieving onsite amenity and maintain an appropriate and transparent standard of amenity for adjacent residents. Seeks to ensure that the standards across the relevant zones (GRZ, MRZ, HRZ) are workable and provide for practical outcomes when actually implemented onsite.	Retain standards in the GRZ, MRZ and HRZ except where amendments are sought through separate submission points.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Pip Beachen	142.14	Amend	Notes that large areas of residentially zoned land in Napier are being required by the Councils Engineering Team to lift finished floor levels significantly higher than existing ground level in order to meet minimum floor level requirements due to the raised flood level. As a result, this compromises the ability to develop a site within the height in relation to boundary parameters. Seeks that the height in relation to boundary line starts at the same level on the boundary as the minimum floor level applied to the site. Refers to Christchurch District Plan (See original submission for full detail)	Amend so that the height in relation to boundary line starts at the same level on the boundary as the minimum floor level applied a site at the relevant boundary.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Pip Beachen	142.15	Support	Supports an impervious area of 70% within the General Residential Zone.	Retain GRZ-S6	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Pip Beachen	142.16	Support	Supports the retention of a fence and wall height of 2m within side and rear yards as significant fill required to be placed in residential sites to achieve minimum floor levels above flood hazards, this is to provide for retaining and an adequate fence height above this retaining while still falling within the permitted height threshold.	Retain GRZ-S8	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Pip Beachen	142.17	Amend	Opposes standard as it is currently worded. As street facing dwellings typically contain a garage (which can occupy up to 50% of a street facing façade), requiring 20% of glazing to then occupy the remaining portion of frontage would compromise the insulation and energy efficiency goals sought by the Building Code. Notes the requirement for passive surveillance and streetscape connectivity, however considers that the requirement for 20% glazing of the full façade is not appropriate in situations where there is a street facing garage. For multi-unit developments, the assessment criteria will apply in addition to the standard. Further flexibility is sought.	Amend the standard to only require 20% of the façade beyond any area occupied by a garage door to be in glazing, or similar alternative relief.	Open Submission

# GRZ - General Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Pip Beachen	142.18	Amend	Supports the outdoor living space standard and the reduction in area from the ODP for ground floor units to 20m <sup>2</sup> however considers that the wording provided for GRZ-S11(1)(b) is unclear as notified this appears to contradict the requirement for a 20m <sup>2</sup> living space. Also the wording of GRZ-S11(3) and seeks further clarity around the interpretation of this standard.	Amend GRZ-S11(1)(b) to provide better clarity around this provision i.e. whether the 20m <sup>2</sup> can be cumulatively met through a combination of balcony and ground floor outdoor living space. Further, amend or delete GRZ-S11(3) as further clarity is required.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Pip Beachen	142.57		Considers that it is important that the standards appropriately facilitate the outcomes sought by Council for the City and further enable efficient development of sites while achieving onsite amenity and maintain an appropriate and transparent standard of amenity for adjacent residents. Seeks to ensure that the standards across the relevant zones (GRZ, MRZ, HRZ, MUZ) are workable and provide for practical outcomes when actually implemented onsite.	Seeks that standards across the relevant zones (GRZ, MRZ, HRZ, MUZ) are workable and provide for practical outcomes when actually implemented onsite. Seeks Amendments or the removal of standards which are overly onerous for residential development or which result in contradicting outcomes to other standards, therefore seeking a consistent approach within each Zone and across the Plan.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Marisa Mous	159.2	Oppose	Submitter opposes the proposed 1.2m height for boundary fences due to concerns of safety, quiet enjoyment of properties, privacy, and animal containment.	Retain current fencing rules.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Sheena McGuire	168.109	Amend	Notes that The GRZ Chapter does not contain a specific rail corridor building setback standard. Instead, the rail corridor boundary is assessed as a side or rear yard site boundary and a 1m building setback applies. Considers that setbacks are a common planning tool used to ensure the safe and efficient operation of activities such as the railway corridor, particularly when it may come into conflict with adjacent land uses. For rail, a setback provides a safe physical distance between a building and the railway corridor boundary. Heavy freight trains run on the railway lines through the Napier City District. Considers that without a sufficient setback, people painting their buildings, clearing gutters or doing works on their roof will need to access or foul the rail corridor. If a person or object encroaches onto the rail corridor, there is a substantial risk of injury or death for the person entering the rail corridor.  Considers that a setback control has obvious safety benefits for the users of the land adjoining the rail corridor and users of the rail corridor. Also notes the efficiency benefits for rail operations, mitigating against the risk of train services being interrupted by unauthorised persons or objects entering the rail corridor. Considers that without appropriate setback requirements, there is significant risk of adverse health and safety effects impacting people locating and working in proximity to the railway corridor. Seeks a new clause within GRZ-S4: Other yards to require a 5m setback for structures and buildings from the rail corridor. Matters of discretion are also sought in the case that the setback cannot be achieved.	Amend as follows:  1. No part of any building may be erected closer than 1 m to a side or rear site boundary unless written approval of the adjacent landowner(s) is provided.  2. Any part of a building for visitor accommodation with frontage onto Meeanee Quay must not be erected closer than 3 m to any side or rear boundary unless written approval of the adjacent landowner(s) is provided.  3. No part of any building, fence, or structure may be erected closer than 6 m to any watercourse or open drain.  4. <u>No part of any building or structure may be located within a 5m setback from a boundary shared with a rail corridor.</u>  Matters of discretion are:  1. Purpose of the standard;  2. Neighbourhood character;  3. Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces;  4. Quality living environments;	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Neil Fenwick	173.1	Oppose	Opposes as rule GRZ-S2 takes no account of the building and boundary orientation, time of the day, the sun angle and its sun or shading effect on neighbouring properties. Considers that the effect of a building 'mass' is not universal on differing adjacent land as the orientation, time of the day and season will have varying effects on neighbouring properties. Acknowledges consideration of orientation is noted in the Residential Standards Table GRZ – General Residential Zone – Standards Table; GRZ-S11 Outdoor Space, Rule 3, a and b.Considers that Hastings District Council's example of how this is dealt with could be introduced into the Napier City Council's Proposed District Plan as a solution (Appendix 8.0-1 – Method of Determining Recession Planes)	Amend to introduce differing requirements related to the orientation of each boundary - Use HDC as the benchmark for this change.	Open Submission

# GRZ - General Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Neil Fenwick	173.2	Oppose	Considers that concerns about personal safety outweigh visual dominance. Considers that Low fences potentially aiding urban crime by providing escape routes and that higher fences needed for sound reduction and privacy. Considers that it is an individual's right to protect themselves through appropriate fencing. Notes the proliferation of security cameras indicates citizen concern for safety. Considers that during early housing and suburban development throughout the 1900's the street became an extension of the landowner's property and low fences may have been appropriate then. Society, mobility via vehicles, proliferation of vehicular movements and crime has changed our perception of safety in this respect. Notes disagreement with planners' socially idealistic view and attempt to recreate past perceptions of safety.	Remove the requirement that limits fence heights on the basis on the basis that the Proposed District Plan is endeavouring to control an aspect of design which must remain under the owners' discretion.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Rules Table	Neil Fenwick	173.3	Oppose	Considers the Activity Status should not be 'Permitted', as of right. Submitter raises the question whether a land owner complying with the net site area of 2000 sq.m. rule can graze livestock in the middle of a Residential Area as a Permitted use, subject to the NCC Animal Control Bylaw 2021.	Delete this use as a 'Permitted Use' as it could be open to abuse. Considers it should be made a Discretionary use.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Neil Fenwick	173.4	Oppose	Acknowledges the intent of taking advantage of the land area for the benefit of the ground floor tenant by specifying minimum dimensions of open space. Rule 1, a, b, c and d., however consider it excessive in its requirement when compared with Rule 2, residential units 'above ground'. Notes that, from a designer's perspective, there are design limitations in relation to >2 storey outdoor living spaces. Considers that a reduction of the requirements of Rule 1 (ground floor) more aligned with Rule 2 (above ground) would present a more equitable design solution.	Seeks further consideration for the rule. As written, it necessarily provides a disadvantage to upper level apartments. Considers that if the rule related to ground floor open space is reduced, it could provide an opportunity for densification of the whole of site development.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Neil Fenwick	173.5	Oppose	Considers that the restriction or otherwise on the percentage of windows facing the street is irrelevant as the design outcome is totally dependent on the orientation and the users access to the exterior. Notes that there are many examples in early residential developments in New Zealand where orientation was adopted from the northern hemisphere, (south facing) or by early design, always oriented to the street which has led to many of our building stock being costly to heat, compromised access to the outside and poor use of the surrounding land. Considers that it would be more beneficial to focus on the above outcomes, rather than prescriptive rules which are inappropriate for the site under consideration.	Delete the rule related to the percentage of windows facing the street because this requirement takes no account of the design outcome which should/must relate to the orientation of the dwelling and the resultant design and planning of the dwelling on the site. Refer to the body of the submission above for detailed examples of how design and orientation can vary the outcome.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone	Simon Bradshaw	182.2	Support	The provisions of the General Residential Zone support stand alone and attached (terraced housing) forms in a suburban character. This is consistent with the objectives for Parklands and they are therefore considered appropriate.	Retain the notified provisions of the General Residential Zone.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Rules Table	Angela McFlynn	189.46	Oppose	Considers precluding public or limited notification for any development of a residential site to contain more than 1 residential unit is not appropriate. Significant increases in density have the potential to have significant adverse effects on the surrounding residential area, and residents have a right to have their concerns considered when there are potential direct effects on the use and enjoyment of their property. The Council, through the District Plan should show respect for their community and allow for public and / or limited notification where appropriate.	Amend GRZ-R1: Residential units and residential activities to:  Notification status: Any application under this rule is precluded from being notified on a public or limited basis <u>only if compliance with all of standards GRZS1-GRZS11 is achieved.</u>	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Jennie Fenwick	193.1	Oppose	Opposes proposed fence heights. High fence heights, keep unwanted people out, help personal safety, provide security, and prevent anti-social disruption. People are not in positions to move from bad neighbours. High fences also minimise noise, help maintain a right to privacy, keep children safe, contains dogs, and allows for full use of property. The right to build high fences on a boundary front is a personal democratic right and choice, it would be unfair to remove this.	Seeks to delete limits on fence heights.  The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.58	Amend	This rule should not apply to minor residential units. One key distinction of minor residential units is that they can share outdoor space with the primary residential unit as they are ancillary / not a stand-alone site.	Amend standard to add exemption for minor residential units complying with the permitted activity standards of GRZ-R3.	Open Submission



# GRZ - General Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.80	Amend	There is no minimum residential unit size standard in the General Residential Zone (only in medium and high density residential zones). Although this level of intensity is not explicitly anticipated for in the GRZ, it is appropriate to have the standard as a backstop to ensure that where smaller units are provided in accordance with the provisions for the GRZ, that they are of sufficient room to accommodate furniture, space to get around, and the anticipated number of residents. This complements the relevant assessment criteria for residential units.	Add a new minimum residential unit standard GRZ-S12 in the General Residential Zone, that replicates MRZ-S13 Minimum residential unit size.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Guy Panckhurst	210.4	Amend	Considers that often subdivision proposals involve a new internal boundary along a vehicle access that is less than 1m from an existing building. The applicant is able to provide "self-approval" for the infringement.	Seeks to amend the wording to clarify that the landowner of a site being subdivided can provide consent that the internal yard can be less than 1m.  The reasons stated in full detail in the full submission.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table /GRZ-S10: Windows to the street	Guy Panckhurst	210.5	Oppose	Opposes the requirement for 20% street facing glazing in the General Density Residential Zone (GRZ). States that the requirement is in the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) and is more suited for this zone and High Density Residential Zones (HRZ). Glazing control is not appropriate for GRZ, GRZ residents should be able to choose their own glazing.	Seeks to remove GRZ-S10 from plan.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Objectives /General	Georgina McPherson	215.117	Amend	None of the objectives, policies or rules in this chapter refer to reverse sensitivity effects. The Fuel Companies have assets which are adjacent to the GRZ and GRZ activities may be sensitive to the effects of these existing lawfully established activities on the adjoining zone. The Fuel Companies seek that reverse sensitivity effects are appropriately managed in this chapter, particularly where it relates to new development or intensification close to non-residential zones.	Add a new objective, policy that address reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent land uses as follows:  <u>GRZ-OXX: Reverse sensitivity</u>  <u>Existing non-residential activities are not unreasonably compromised by reverse sensitivity effects and/or incompatible activities in adjacent zones.</u>  <u>GRZ-PXX: Reverse sensitivity</u>  <u>Ensure that existing non-residential activities in adjacent zones are not compromised by reverse sensitivity effects.</u>  Amend matters of discretion under GRZ-R1B, GRZ- R7B, and GRZ-R8B to include reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent land uses.  GRZ-R1B: Residential units and residential activity GRZ-R3B: Minor residential unit  GRZ-R^: Residential care facility GRZ-R7B: Visitor accommodation GRZ-R8B: Educational facility  GRZ-R10 Retirement village premises  GRZ-R11 Activities infringing standards	Open Submission

# GRZ - General Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Policies /General	Georgina McPherson	215.118	Oppose	None of the objectives, policies or rules in this chapter refer to reverse sensitivity effects. The Fuel Companies have assets which are adjacent to the GRZ and GRZ activities may be sensitive to the effects of these existing lawfully established activities on the adjoining zone. The Fuel Companies seek that reverse sensitivity effects are appropriately managed in this chapter, particularly where it relates to new development or intensification close to non-residential zones.	<p>Add a new objective, policy that address reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent land uses as follows:</p> <p><u>GRZ-OXX: Reverse sensitivity</u></p> <p><u>Existing non-residential activities are not unreasonably compromised by reverse sensitivity effects and/or incompatible activities in adjacent zones.</u></p> <p><u>GRZ-PXX: Reverse sensitivity</u></p> <p><u>Ensure that existing non-residential activities in adjacent zones are not compromised by reverse sensitivity effects.</u></p> <p>Amend matters of discretion under GRZ-R1B, GRZ- R7B, and GRZ-R8B to include reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent land uses.</p> <p>GRZ-R1B: Residential units and residential activity GRZ-R3B: Minor residential unit</p> <p>GRZ-R^: Residential care facility GRZ-R7B: Visitor accommodation GRZ-R8B: Educational facility</p> <p>GRZ-R10 Retirement village premises</p> <p>GRZ-R11 Activities infringing standards</p>	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Amelia Longley	222.15	Amend	Standards for fences in or adjacent to Open Space zones could result in undesirable outcomes for open space.	Delete these provisions from the Open Space zones or ensure provisions are written to provide for consistent fencing around the perimeter of Council parks and open spaces. Amend relevant residential and open space standards to ensure fencing controls adjacent to open space will provide for consistent fencing around parks and reserves. I.e. where a fence is higher than 1.2 m, the fencing style beyond the 1.2 m is visually permeable.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Rules Table	Sean Thompson	225.1	Amend	<p>Considers that it is not self-evident from the analysis and rationale in the proposed plan, including in terms of s 32 RMA, why relocated buildings should be classified as non-complying in the NCZ, LCZ, LFRZ, LIZ and GIZ. It is accepted that relocated buildings should be discretionary in the Natural Open Space Zone, and there may be urban design and other considerations applicable to the Town Centre Zone and City Centre Zone which warrant different treatment.</p> <p>Since a 2004 Central Otago Environment Court decision most local authorities in New Zealand have either adopted permitted activity classification for relocated buildings (with no standards) or provided for permitted activity status with prescribed performance standards.</p>	<p>Seeks to amend the relocated buildings activity PDP Rules as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide for relocated buildings as a Permitted Activity (like GRZ-R9) in all relevant zones, excepting where a specified heritage or conservation or urban design consideration applies;</li> <li>For the relocated building rules in all zones, the removal of the requirement to deposit a monitoring fee (like GRZ-R9) at the same time as submitting the relocated building report;</li> <li>Amending the performance standards in relation to relocated buildings in accordance with the wording in the attached Schedule 1 (which can be found in the attached submission), to provide for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>modification of the performance timeframes such that relocation on permanent foundation is required within two months, and twelve months is allowed for the completion of all reinstatement works;</li> <li>provision for a pre-inspection report in the same or similar form as found in Schedule 2 (which can be found in the attached submission).</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>Consequential or further relief including to the relevant objectives, policies and provisions of the proposed plan in order to give effect to the relief sought.</p> <p>(The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)</p>	Open Submission

# GRZ - General Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Objectives /GRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.40	Amend	<p>Considers Amending GRZ. Supports the management of development and general activities that encourage safe, active and interactive communities. The Ministry recognises the primary purpose of the GRZ is to prioritise residential activities. However, the Ministry considers that educational facilities particularly early childhood centres and schools need to be located in residential areas to enable all members of the community to have adequate access to education.</p> <p>The GRZ objectives do not sufficiently provide for educational facilities in the objectives. There are also no clear objectives that corelate with Policy GRZ-P6 for non-residential activities (which educational facilities are). Therefore, the Ministry request GRZ-O2 is amended to recognises that some activities like educational facilities should be enabled in the zone provided the contribute to social, economic and cultural wellbeing.</p>	<p>Seeks to Amend the following:</p> <p><b>Community wellbeing</b></p> <p>Development and activities contribute to safe, active, and interactive communities <u>that provide for the community's social, economic, and cultural wellbeing.</u></p>	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Policies /GRZ-P6: Non-residential activities	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.41	Amend	<p>Considers Amending GRZ-P6. The Ministry recognises the primary purpose of the GRZ is to prioritise residential activities. However, the Ministry considers that educational facilities particularly early childhood centres and schools need to be located in residential areas to enable all members of the community to have access to education. If schools cannot locate in residential areas, traffic congestion can increase as parents have to drive their kids across town to school. Educational facilities are a crucial form of social infrastructure that is required to meet the education needs and wellbeing of the community.</p> <p>To achieve best planning practice, educational facilities should be represented in the objectives and policies as well as its own rule framework. Although the Ministry use the Notice of Requirement (NoR) process for its school sites, in the Ministry's experience the objectives and policies of the relevant zone are important provisions used to assess NoRs.</p> <p>The Ministry request that an additional provision is included that enables non-residential activities (like educational facilities) if they support the community needs and wellbeing. This will allow the Ministry to provided schools for the community and better respond to growth over time.</p>	<p>Seeks to make the following Amendment:</p> <p><b>GRZ-P6: Non-residential activities</b></p> <p>Limit Non-residential activities in the zone to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>prioritise efficient use of the zone for residential activities;</li> <li>minimise effects on the vitality of centre zones, and</li> <li>minimise effects on residential amenity</li> <li><u>only those required to support well-functioning urban environments.</u></li> </ol>	Open Submission

# GRZ - General Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Rules Table	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.42	Amend	<p>Requests rule GRZ-R8A is amended to provide for educational facilities, such as childcare services, for up to 50 students (excluding staff and permanent residents) as a permitted activity. This would better align with the typical sizes of pre-school facilities established in the Residential zones in either established buildings or in new-builds as well as the Ministry's pre-school license requirements. This also recognises the accepted actual effects of these facilities as established in the Residential area.</p> <p>The sixth matter of discretion listed under rule GRZ-R8B will allow council to assess matters outside of the Ministry control and could imply the Ministry may need to fund the upgrade of the roading network to provide these multi modal facilities. Any road upgrades should be funded and provided by the council or developers who are enabling the residential growth that the Ministry must respond to. The Ministry request the removal of this matter of discretion.</p> <p>The Ministry also does not support the third matter of discretion either, as they allow council to assess additional matters that are outside of the Ministry's control. The Ministry has no control over the location and connectivity into the street network and surrounding public open space. The safety and attractiveness of the street are already covered by the second matter of discretion, as it allows council to assess the effects of the school on the streetscape and neighbourhood character. The Ministry consider this an appropriate matter of discretion, as it is a matter the applicant / Ministry can control through careful design.</p> <p>Anything beyond the boundary of the school site should not be assessed as the</p>	<p>Seeks to make the following amendments:</p> <p><b>Educational facility GRZ-R8A</b></p> <p><b>Activity Status:</b> Permitted</p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The educational facility does not cater for more than <del>ten</del> 50 students, and</li> <li>The total number of people accommodated/catered for on the site by activities GRZ-R6 – GRZ-R8 is no more than <del>ten</del> 50 (excluding staff and permanent residents).</li> </ol> <p><b>GRZ-R8B</b></p> <p><b>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met:</b> Restricted Discretionary</p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contribution to local community wellbeing;</li> <li>Neighbourhood character;</li> <li><del>Safety, attractiveness and connectivity of streets and public open spaces;</del></li> <li>Quality living environments;</li> <li>Infrastructure capacity and stormwater management;</li> <li><del>Safety and efficiency of multi-modal transport network, and</del></li> <li><del>Vibrancy and vitality of centres.</del></li> </ol>	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Assessment criteria /GRZ-AC2: Home business (GRZ-R4); Residential care facilities, visitor accommodation, educational facilities, community facilities, hospitality activity and dairies (GRZ-R6 - GRZ-R8)	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.43	Support	Supports GRZ-AC2 as educational facilities (as non- residential activities) are a critical part of contributing to the wellbeing of the local community by improving access to education.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Objectives /General	Angela Jones	240.15	Amend	Considers it necessary for similar protections be provided to those in the Subdivision chapter (SUB-O3) insofar as it recognises the need for development to protect the operation and access to established and planned network utilities and regionally significant infrastructure.	<p>Include a new objective:</p> <p><u>GRZ-Ox: Infrastructure provision</u></p> <p><u>Development protects the operation and access to established and planned network utilities and regionally significant infrastructure while mitigating reverse sensitivity effects.</u></p>	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Policies /General	Angela Jones	240.16	Amend	Considers it necessary for similar protections be provided to those in the Subdivision chapter (SUB-P9) insofar as it recognises the need for development to protect the operation and access to established and planned network utilities and regionally significant infrastructure.	<p>Include a new policy:</p> <p><u>GRZ-Px: Integrated provision of infrastructure</u></p> <p><u>Require development to provide servicing that is coordinated, integrated, and compatible with the existing and planned infrastructure network.</u></p>	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone/GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Margaret Hunt	242.1	Oppose	Opposes the proposed height provisions for the loss of privacy, neighbourhood character and access to sunlight, Considers the added noise from traffic congestion without sufficient infrastructure to support growth. Considers the negative impact of intensification and increased building heights on property valuation. Considers the risk of new building styles being inappropriate with non-notification status.	Amend to provide for improved public transport systems. No specific relief stated	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Margaret Hunt	242.2	Oppose	Opposes proposed garage provisions due to lack of off street parking highlighting Meanee Road into King St, Peddie St and Elbourne St.	Amend to provide for improved public transport systems. No specific relief stated	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Rules Table	Margaret Hunt	242.3		Concern with the congestion of educational facilities with no provision or insufficient access for varied transport modes used by community/students.	Amend to provide for improved public transport systems. No specific relief stated	Open Submission

# GRZ - General Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Rules Table /GRZ-R8: Educational facility	Maryanne Macintosh	243.3		<p>Many Schools within MRZ are already up to capacity, submitter states children need space.</p> <p>Has concerns of Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) impacting quality of life. Living in an attractive environment with greenspace is important to people's well-being.</p> <p>Infrastructure is another concern, with reference to stormwater during the cyclone. Notes, Singapore's requirements for greenspaces, flooding of streets, grass is needed for water drainage, and a geyser in Elbourne Street.</p> <p>Considers safety of elderly important, with reference to break ins. Submitter states MRZ and HRZ makes it harder to know neighbours, creating a loss of connection.</p>	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /General	Phil Stickney	263.32	Oppose	<p>The Submitter has a specific interest in a number of larger sites on Napier Hill which fall under the aforementioned GRZ Zone and PREC-3 provisions. These highly modified sites have historically been used for healthcare services with larger buildings constructed by the Government, including the former multi storey nurses' hostel which has only recently been demolished. This site in particular represents a significant opportunity, on a vacant site, for a comprehensive residential development however that is not enabled by the provisions of the GRZ, or the provisions associated with the PREC3 - Napier Hill / Mataruahou Amenity Precinct. given their size and location they can offer an opportunity for an efficient use of larger sites for higher density residential development, visitor accommodation, residential care, and retirement uses.</p>	<p>Include narrative which recognises and provides for higher density development on specified sites within PREC 3, specifically:</p> <p>a) 20A/B Hospital Terrace,                      b) 186 Battery Road,                      c) 79 Napier terrace,                      d) 102 Chaucer Road,                      e) 2 sixty fifth St and                      f) 2 Parade Street.</p>	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential /General	Alan Petersen	272.3	Amend	<p>Considers that a Bay View Amenity Precinct should be added.</p> <p>Submission 4 - That the Bay View urban areas be zoned GRZ. But its distinct character be recognised by a Precinct overlay as outlined in relief sought (similar to Napier Hill).</p> <p>The overlay of a Precinct zone in the GRZ allows for adjustment to the GRZ that recognises the distinct character of an urban/residential area in Napier City.</p>	<p>Seeks to add a Precinct for Bay View (with an underlying GRZ - General Residential Zone) with the following Policies:</p> <p><b><u>PRECXX-P1: Identify and map the features that make up the amenity character of the Bay View Amenity Precinct</u></b></p> <p><u>Identify the key components that contribute to the amenity values and character of the Bay View Amenity Precinct, including:</u></p> <p><u>a. section size and configuration and residential density;</u>  <u>b. topography and roading layout;</u>  <u>c. vegetation coverage and open space, and</u>  <u>d. position of houses on the section.</u></p> <p><b><u>PRECXX-P2: Character and amenity values</u></b></p> <p><u>Manage development to maintain the identified character and amenity values of the Bay View Amenity Precinct, including by:</u></p> <p><u>a. providing for a generally lower density and intensity of development than the General Residential Zone with 600m2 minimum lot area and 1500m2 for unserviced sites.</u>  <u>b. providing for a higher proportion of open space and landscaped area than the General Residential Zone.</u>  <u>c. requiring developments for multiple residential units to respond to the identified character and amenity values of the Bay View Amenity Precinct, and</u>  <u>d. requiring appropriate infrastructure is in place to support new</u></p>	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Issues /GRZ-I1: Housing supply and diversity	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.109	Support	<p>Supports issue I1 as it enables and encourages higher density development in locations that are close to neighbourhood centres or bus routes, therefore promoting public transport use or multi modal use.</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

# GRZ - General Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Policies /GRZ-P2: Streets and public open space	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.110	Support	Supports policy GRZ-P2 as it promotes safe streets that encourages active transport modes. Encouraging active transport modes is consistent with the NZTA Sustainability Action Plan: Toitū Te Taiao, which seeks to shift travel to more efficient modes of transport. Notes that this recognises the growing expectation that the transport sector will contribute to the substantial reduction in domestic greenhouse gas emissions	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Policies /GRZ-P4: Quality living environments – within the site	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.111	Amend	Considers dwellings should be appropriately designed and insulated to mitigate noise effects from the existing environment in the interests of the human health of occupants. Considers that separation is often the best method for managing non-compatible land use but where separation is not possible, treatment is required to protect sensitive receivers.	Amend so that <u>where located in proximity to legally established activities that emit noise (such as State Highways), buildings for noise sensitive activities are designed to mitigate noise and vibration effects to occupants.</u>	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone/Introduction/	Alan Petersen	281.19	Amend	The introduction statements and provisions are nearly all appropriate for the site at 68 Franklin Rd and the Bay View urban or suburban areas.	The site at 68 Franklin Rd should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Issues /GRZ-I1: Housing supply and diversity	Alan Petersen	281.20	Amend	The issues are applicable to the Bay View urban area and the development site. The limited future developments will assist in the supply of housing. To meet the HPUDS goals.	The site at 68 Franklin Rd should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone. The Bay View urban residential areas should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Issues /GRZ-I2: Quality living environments	Alan Petersen	281.21	Amend	The issues are applicable to the development site.	The site at 68 Franklin Rd should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone. The Bay View urban residential areas should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Issues /GRZ-I3: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Alan Petersen	281.22	Amend	The issues are applicable to the development site.	The site at 68 Franklin Rd should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone. The Bay View urban residential areas should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Issues /GRZ-I4: Non residential activities	Alan Petersen	281.23	Amend	The issues are applicable to the Bay View suburban area and the development site.	The site at 68 Franklin Rd should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone. The Bay View urban residential areas should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Objectives /GRZ-O1: Housing supply and diversity	Alan Petersen	281.24	Amend	All the objectives are applicable to the Bay View suburban area and the development site.	The site at 68 Franklin Rd should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone. The Bay View urban residential areas should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table /General	Alan Petersen	281.25	Amend	The proposed development at 68 Franklin Road provides for (for the large part) development that complies with the standards in the General Residential Zone. Many of these same standards could be applied to the Bay View urban area. The GRZ is also proposed for the Westshore suburb. This urban environment is very similar to the Bay View urban environment.	The site at 68 Franklin Rd should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone. The Bay View urban residential areas should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Kainga Ora - Brendon Liggett	285.2	Oppose	Opposes the use of the word 'maintain and enhance' within the purpose statements in the respective 'Standards Tables' of the GRZ, MRZ and HRZ. Seeks that these are amended to refer to the 'planned built environment' in line with the objectives and policies of each zone and Policy 6 of the NPS-UD. The consequential requirement for development to 'maintain and enhance' the existing character of an area conflicts with the overall direction of the PDP to enable growth and intensification.	Amend to refer to the 'planned built environment' in line with the objectives and policies of each zone and Policy 6 of the NPS-UD. The consequential requirement for development to 'maintain and enhance' the existing character of an area conflicts with the overall direction of the PDP to enable growth and intensification.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Rules Table	Kainga Ora - Brendon Liggett	285.5	Amend	Seeks that the permitted number of dwellings be increased as follows:  (a) GRZ-R1A – Increase the number of dwellings permitted on site within the GRZ from 1 to 2 dwellings,	Increase the number of dwellings permitted on site within the GRZ from 1 to 2 dwellings,	Open Submission

# GRZ - General Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Assessment criteria /GRZ-AC1: Residential units (GRZ-R1); Minor residential units (GRZ-R3); Relocated buildings (GRZ-R9); Retirement village premises (GRZ-R10)	Kainga Ora - Brendon Liggett	285.10	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the District Plan and seeks that reference to these are deleted. Considers that these act as de-facto rules to be complied with. Opposes any policy or rule approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Considers that Design Guidelines should be treated as a non- statutory tool and should sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. Seeks that any specific design guideline be relocated within a specific rule, matter of discretion or assessment criterion. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment. Notes that reference to design guidance that is regulated by another Council removes the ability for Council to adapt the guidance to reflect best practice and the planned built environment for the local urban environment of Napier City.	Delete reference to Design Guidelines in the District Plan	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Rules Table	Alec Duncan	288.58	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency requires the ability to construct and operate emergency service facilities (i.e., fire stations) in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies. This means new fire stations may be necessary in any zone across the district in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the effects of a fire station can be largely anticipated and, in the most part, do not differ to the effects of many activities that may be anticipated through rural and urban environments.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency requests that emergency service facilities are provided for as permitted activities in the larger, more extensive zones of the district to recognise the critical importance of emergency services to communities. In providing for emergency service facility as a permitted activity would mean that emergency service facilities would be controlled by the subsequent performance standards of each zone (such as height, height in relation to boundary, front yards, building coverage requirements).and the other relevant performance standards in other chapters (i.e., transport) to ensure that any effects are appropriately managed.</p>	<p>Include new permitted activity as follows:</p> <p><b><u>xxx-Rx: Emergency service facilities</u></b>  <b><u>Activity status: Permitted</u></b></p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard</p>	Open Submission

# GRZ - General Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Alec Duncan	288.76	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency's main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</p> <p>SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB-S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.</p> <p>In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and</p>	<p>Seeks to include a new performance standard as follows:  <b>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</b>            1. All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.            2. Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.  <b>Matter of discretion:</b>            1. The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.            Or            To similar effect.            And            any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.</p>	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Objectives /GRZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Alec Duncan	288.103	Support	<p>Fire and Emergency supports GRZ-O5 insofar that it requires public health and environmental wellbeing be maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure. This would include firefighting water supply and access for Fire and Emergency operations.</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Policies /GRZ-P6: Non-residential activities	Alec Duncan	288.104	Amend	<p>Seeks that emergency service facilities be provided for as a permitted activity. This should be supported by GRZ-P6 to acknowledge the important role of emergency services in the community.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:  <b>GRZ-P6: Non-residential activities</b>  <b>Limit non-residential activities in the zone to:</b>            a. prioritise the efficient use of the zone for residential activities;            b. minimise the effects on the vitality of centre zones, <del>and</del>            c. minimise effects on residential amenity, <u>and</u>            d. <u>those that provide for the health, safety and wellbeing of the community.</u></p>	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /Policies /GRZ-P7: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Alec Duncan	288.105	Support	<p>Supports GRZ-P7 insofar that it seeks to ensure sufficient infrastructure provision and/or mitigation measures to accommodate demand. This would include firefighting water supply and access for Fire and Emergency operations.</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Alec Duncan	288.106	Amend	<p>Seeks the inclusion of a new matter of discretion to provide NCC the ability to consider the risk of non-compliance with GRZ-S3 on emergency service access. It is important that emergency service access suitable for Fire and Emergency personnel is provided at site boundaries, as well as provision for emergency egress by residents.</p>	<p>Add a new matter of discretion to GRZ-S3 as follows:            x. <u>The ability for emergency services to safely and efficient access the site.</u></p>	Open Submission
GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table	Alec Duncan	288.107	Amend	<p>Seeks the inclusion of a new matter of discretion to provide NCC the ability to consider the risk of non-compliance with GRZ-S4 on emergency service access. It is important that emergency service access suitable for Fire and Emergency personnel is provided at site boundaries, as well as provision for emergency egress by residents.</p>	<p>Add a new matter of discretion to GRZ-S4 as follows:            x. <u>The ability for emergency services to safely and efficient access the site.</u></p>	Open Submission



# LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone /LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone - Standards Table	Susan Dallas	25.2	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone /LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone - Standards Table	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.2	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone /LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone - Standards Table	Peter Grant	78.19	Support	Supports the proposed standards for fences and walls. Safety and visibility from and to the street are important for older people, particularly for those living alone. Social connections within neighbourhoods are important and lower fence heights go some way towards achieving this. Passive surveillance of the streetscape also helps with crime prevention.	Incorporate design guidelines to ensure utilisation of appropriate fence design and products.	Open Submission
LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone /LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone - Rules Table	Andrea Millar	105.11	Support	Supports the permitted activity rules applying to “residential units” and “residential activity” in the zone as appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided by Ara Poutama.	Retain permitted activity rule LLRZ-R1 applying to “residential units” and “residential activity” in the Large Lot Residential Zone.	Open Submission
LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone /LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone - Rules Table	Jeff Reid	137.1	Oppose	Considers that LLRZ-R5: Grazing of livestock should not be a Discretionary Activity Rule in the LLRZ as stock grazing is the most efficient form of grass, weed and fire maintenance where terrain is a challenge to accessibility. There is also the resource consent application costs and as a Discretionary Activity, the uncertainty of any Council decision. The Rule is also an inefficient duplication of The Napier City Council Animal Control Bylaw 2021.	Remove the Discretionary Activity rule, in relation to the Grazing of Livestock.	Open Submission
LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone /LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone - Rules Table	Jeff Reid	138.1	Oppose	Considers that LLRZ-R4: Minor residential unit should not be a Discretionary Activity Rule in the LLRZ as the zone contains relatively spacious section sizes that are / were purchased for their ability under the Operative Plan to provide for a minor dwelling. Provided a site can comply with the LLRZ amenity Standards for a minor dwelling then it should be a Permitted Activity.	Seeks to remove Discretionary Activity and replace with Permitted Activity status where LLRZ-R4: Minor residential unit can comply with the LLRZ - Standards.	Open Submission
LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone /LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone - Rules Table	Jeff Reid	138.2	Oppose	Considers that LLRZ-R8: Visitor accommodation should not be a Discretionary Activity Rule in the LLRZ as the zone contains relatively spacious section sizes that are suitable for visitor accommodation. Provided a site can comply with the LLRZ amenity Standards for visitor accommodation then it should be a Permitted Activity.	Seeks to remove Discretionary Activity and replace with Permitted Activity status where LLRZ-R8: Visitor accommodation can comply with the LLRZ - Standards.	Open Submission
LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone /LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone - Rules Table	Keith Peacock	164.3	Oppose	Opposes as stock are the best and cheapest form of grass and weed control on hillside sites, and a number of these sites have land that cannot currently be developed or easily maintained. Grazing by stock is the best means to manage grass and weeds and mitigate fire risk. Considers that this method of property maintenance should not be subject to gaining a Discretionary Consent at the cost of the land owner and with no certainty of being granted. Notes that this matter is managed under the NCC Animal Control Bylaw and requiring a Resource Consent is an unnecessary duplication of regulation while Bylaws manage nuisance effects.	Delete Rule relating to Grazing of stock	Open Submission
LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone /LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone - Rules Table	Keith Peacock	164.4	Oppose	Opposes as the discretion rule not permitting minor dwellings is overly restrictive. Notes that properties in this zone are relatively large sections and often are purchased or owned by families wanting to provide additional space for family or relatives in a minor stand-alone dwelling. If these lots can provide for a minor dwelling that complies with the bulk, location and landscaping standards (which manage the amenity effects) then the activity of building a minor dwelling should be a permitted activity.	Amend activity status for Minor Residential Unit from Discretionary activity to permitted activity subject to bulk and location standards.	Open Submission

# LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone /LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone - Rules Table	Keith Peacock	164.5	Oppose	Opposes as the discretion rule not permitting visitor accommodation is overly restrictive. Notes that properties in this zone are relatively large sections and open themselves to opportunity to provide temporary visitor accommodation, especially for local events such as the Mission Concert and Church Road concerts. Considers that it also allows flexibility for landowners to utilise surplus units, rooms or sleepouts for accommodation and support the wider tourism market. It is also considered that the zone is suitable for type of activity at a suitable scale. If properties in this zone can provide for a visitor accommodation activity that complies with the bulk, location and landscaping standards (which manage the amenity effects) then the activity should be a permitted activity.	Amend activity status for Visitor Accommodation from Discretionary activity to permitted activity subject to bulk and location standards.	Open Submission
LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone /LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone - Standards Table	Sheena McGuire	168.110	Amend	<p>Notes that the LLRZ Chapter does not contain a specific rail corridor building setback standard. Instead, the rail corridor boundary is assessed as a side or rear yard site boundary and a 3m building setback applies with the exception of agricultural, horticultural or viticultural buildings. Supports a 6m setback for buildings associated with these activities. Considers that setbacks are a common planning tool used to ensure the safe and efficient operation of activities such as the railway corridor, particularly when it may come into conflict with adjacent land uses. For rail, a setback provides a safe physical distance between a building and the railway corridor boundary. Heavy freight trains run on the railway lines through the Napier City District. Considers that without a sufficient setback, people painting their buildings, clearing gutters or doing works on their roof will need to access or foul the rail corridor.</p> <p>If a person or object encroaches onto the rail corridor, there is a substantial risk of injury or death for the person entering the rail corridor. Considers that a setback control has obvious safety benefits for the users of the land adjoining the rail corridor and users of the rail corridor. Also notes the efficiency benefits for rail operations, mitigating against the risk of train services being interrupted by unauthorised persons or objects entering the rail corridor. Considers that without appropriate setback requirements, there is significant risk of adverse health and safety effects impacting people locating and working in proximity to the railway corridor. Seeks a new clause within LLRZ-S4:Other yards to require a 5m setback for structures and buildings from the rail corridor. Matters of discretion are also sought in the case that the setback cannot be achieved.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No part of any building may be erected closer than 3 m to a side or rear site boundary.</li> <li>2. Any part of any building associated with an agricultural, horticultural, or viticultural activity must not be erected closer than 6 m to a side or rear boundary.</li> <li>3. Any part of a building, fence, or structure must not be erected closer than 6 m from the top of the bank of any watercourse or open drain.</li> <li>4. <u>No part of any building or structure may be located within a 5m setback from a boundary shared with a rail corridor.</u></li> </ol> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Purpose of the standard;</li> <li>2. Spacious peri-urban character;</li> <li>3. Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces;</li> <li>4. Quality living environments;</li> <li>5. Operation and maintenance of watercourses and open drains;</li> <li>6. <u>The safe and efficient operation of the rail network;</u></li> <li>7. <u>Compatibility with the surrounding environment; and</u></li> <li>8. The reason for the reduced setback.</li> </ol>	Open Submission
LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone /LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone - Rules Table	Angela McFlynn	189.50	Amend	Considers allowing Minor residential units to establish on larger sites within residential zones as a permitted activity provides for the efficient use of the land resource.	<p>Amend LLRZ-R4: Minor residential unit as follows:</p> <p>LLRZ-R4A</p> <p>Activity Status: <del>Discretionary</del> <u>Permitted</u></p> <p>Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. One minor residential unit per site, and</li> <li>2. The gross floor area of the unit does not exceed 80 m<sup>2</sup>.</li> </ol>	Open Submission

# LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone /LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone - Rules Table	Angela McFlynn	189.51	Amend	Considers that existing buildings should be able to be used for this purpose without the need to first obtain a resource consent.	Amend LLRZ-R8: Visitor accommodation as follows:  LLRZ-R8: Visitor accommodation  Activity Status: <del>Discretionary</del> <u>Permitted</u>  <u>Where:</u>  1. <u>The activity is being carried out within an existing residential building.</u>  <u>LLRZ-R8B</u>  Activity Status where conditions are not met: <u>Discretionary</u>	Open Submission
LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone /LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone - Rules Table	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.61	Amend	Rules are not listed in order of activity status.	Amend rule ordering and numbering to list permitted activities first, followed by controlled, restricted discretionary, discretionary, non-complying.	Open Submission
LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone /LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone - Rules Table	Sean Thompson	225.2	Amend	Considers that it is not self-evident from the analysis and rationale in the proposed plan, including in terms of s 32 RMA, why relocated buildings should be classified as non-complying in the NCZ, LCZ, LFRZ, LIZ and GIZ. It is accepted that relocated buildings should be discretionary in the Natural Open Space Zone, and there may be urban design and other considerations applicable to the Town Centre Zone and City Centre Zone which warrant different treatment.  Since a 2004 Central Otago Environment Court decision most local authorities in New Zealand have either adopted permitted activity classification for relocated buildings (with no standards) or provided for permitted activity status with prescribed performance standards.	Seeks to amend the relocated buildings activity PDP Rules as follows:  a. Provide for relocated buildings as a permitted activity in all relevant zones (like LLRZ), excepting where a specified heritage or conservation or urban design consideration applies; b. For the relocated building rules in all zones, the removal of the requirement to deposit a monitoring fee at the same time as submitting the relocated building report; c. Amending the performance standards in relation to relocated buildings in accordance with the wording in the attached Schedule 1 (which can be found in the attached submission), to provide for: i. modification of the performance timeframes such that relocation on permanent foundation is required within two months, and twelve months is allowed for the completion of all reinstatement works; ii. provision for a pre-inspection report in the same or similar form as found in Schedule 2 (which can be found in the attached submission).  Consequential or further relief including to the relevant objectives, policies and provisions of the proposed plan in order to give effect to relief sought.  (The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)	Open Submission

# LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone /Objectives /General	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.44	Amend	<p>Considers Amending Large Lot Residential (LLRZ), recognises that the primary purpose of the LLRZ is to prioritise large lot residential development. However, Educational facilities are typically located within residential zones as they are required to support the surrounding residential catchment. It is important that the objectives and policies of residential zones reflect the requirement for educational facilities to locate in each residential zone. Although the Ministry uses the NoR process for its school sites, in the Ministry's experience the objectives and policies of the relevant zone are important provisions used to assess NoRs. Therefore, without these supporting provisions the NoR process can become challenging for the Ministry.</p> <p>The LLRZ objectives do not sufficiently provide for educational facilities. Therefore, the Ministry supports the inclusion of a new objective that will allow educational facilities to be recognised as a non-residential activity to provide for the social and economic wellbeing of the surrounding communities. This will also create an objective that correlates with the Ministry's requested changes in LLRZ-P1 to enable educational facilities to support the needs of the surrounding community. Correlating objectives and policies achieve best planning practices as well.</p>	<p>Seeks to make the following Amendment, to include a new objective that allows educational Facilities to be recognised as a non-residential activity, and to create an objective that correlates with the Ministry's requested changes in LLRZ-P1 to enable educational facilities to support the needs of the surrounding community:</p> <p><u>LLRZ-OX</u></p> <p><u>Non-Residential activities</u></p> <p><u>Non-residential activities align with the overall character and amenity of the Large Lot Residential Zone and provide for the community's social, economic, and cultural wellbeing.</u></p>	Open Submission
LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone /Policies /LLRZ-P1: Landscape character, ecological, and mana whenua values	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.45	Amend	<p>Recognises the importance of maintaining the character of the LLRZ, however wherever there is a residential population, there can be a requirement for the Ministry to provide educational facilities. The Ministry request this zone enables the establishment of any childcare facilities or schools that are required to meet the education needs of the LLRZ.</p> <p>The Ministry also requests that an operational needs test is added to subpart (d). This this will allow council the confidence that non- residential activities that detract from the peri-urban character will be avoided while acknowledging that some activities, like schools, may have an operational need to locate in the LLRZ. Schools are designed in a way that tries not to detract from the surrounding character.</p> <p>However, 'character' is subjective. Including an operational needs test would still allow the Ministry to provide educational facilities for communities in the LLRZ should there be a demand for it.</p>	<p>Seeks to make the following amendments.</p> <p><b>Landscape character, ecological, and mana whenua values</b></p> <p>Achieve a spacious peri-urban residential character that provides a transition between urban and rural areas by providing for primarily single storey residential buildings surrounded by significant areas of open space and landscaping including by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>limiting the height, bulk and form of development;</li> <li>avoiding multi-residential unit development;</li> <li>requiring setbacks and landscaped areas that are consistent with a semi- rural character, and</li> <li>avoiding non-residential activities that detract from the peri-urban character, <u>unless there is a functional or operational need for it to locate there.</u></li> <li></li> </ol> <p>Relates to LLRZ-O1 and LLRZ-O3</p>	Open Submission
LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone /LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone - Rules Table	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.46	Amend	<p>Opposes and wishes to amend the discretionary activity status for educational facilities and requests that educational facilities are provided for as a Restricted Discretionary activity in the LLRZ.</p> <p>The Ministry recognises the importance of maintaining the character and amenity of the LLRZ zone. The Ministry feels that any effects that arise from educational facilities can be appropriately managed and mitigated through carefully crafted matters of discretion. The matters of discretion proposed have been taken from other chapters in the Plan. However, if council does not support these, the ministry would appreciate the opportunity to work with council to refine these matters of discretion.</p> <p>The Ministry considers that educational facilities should be provided for in this zone as educational facilities are considered essential social infrastructure that may need to locate within the LLRZ.</p>	<p>Seeks to add the following to LLRZ-R9:</p> <p><b>Educational Facility</b></p> <p><b>Activity Status:</b> <del>Discretionary</del> <u>Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Scale, design, layout, setbacks and screening</u></li> <li><u>Contribution to local community wellbeing;</u></li> <li><u>Neighbourhood character and visual amenity;</u></li> <li><u>Open space character</u></li> <li><u>Reverse sensitivity on surrounding properties and any rural activities</u></li> <li><u>Infrastructure capacity and stormwater management.</u></li> </ol>	Open Submission

# LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone /LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone - Rules Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.59	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency requires the ability to construct and operate emergency service facilities (i.e., fire stations) in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies. This means new fire stations may be necessary in any zone across the district in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the effects of a fire station can be largely anticipated and, in the most part, do not differ to the effects of many activities that may be anticipated through rural and urban environments.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency requests that emergency service facilities are provided for as permitted activities in the larger, more extensive zones of the district to recognise the critical importance of emergency services to communities. In providing for emergency service facility as a permitted activity would mean that emergency service facilities would be controlled by the subsequent performance standards of each zone (such as height, height in relation to boundary, front yards, building coverage requirements).and the other relevant performance standards in other chapters (i.e., transport) to ensure that any effects are appropriately managed.</p>	<p>Seeks to include new permitted activity as follows:  <b>xxx-Rx: Emergency service facilities</b>  <b>Activity status:</b> Permitted</p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard</p>	Open Submission
LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone /LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.77	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency's main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</p> <p>SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB-S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.</p> <p>In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and</p>	<p>Seeks to include a new performance standard as follows:  <b>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</b></p> <p><u>1. All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u></p> <p><u>2. Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p><u>Matter of discretion:</u></p> <p><u>1. The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to</p>	Open Submission
LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone /Objectives /LLRZ-O3: Public health and environmental wellbeing	Alec Duncan	288.108	Support	<p>Fire and Emergency support this objective as it seeks development and activities that contribute to the safety of communities. This would include emergency service facilities.</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone /Policies /LLRZ-P5: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Alec Duncan	288.109	Support	<p>Supports LLRZ-P5 insofar that it seeks the provision for onsite water storage where reticulated services are not available and to ensure sufficient infrastructure provision and/or mitigation measures to accommodate demand. This would include firefighting water supply and access for Fire and Emergency operations.</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

# LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone /LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone - Standards Table	Alec Duncan	288.110	Amend	Seeks the inclusion of a new matter of discretion to provide NCC the ability to consider the risk of non-compliance with LLRZ-S3 on emergency service access. It is important that emergency service access suitable for Fire and Emergency personnel is provided at site boundaries, as well as provision for emergency egress by residents.	Add a new matter of discretion to LLRZ-S3 as follows: <u>x. The ability for emergency services to safely and efficient access the site.</u>	Open Submission
LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone /LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone - Standards Table	Alec Duncan	288.111	Amend	Seeks the inclusion of a new matter of discretion to provide NCC the ability to consider the risk of non-compliance with LLRZ-S4 on emergency service access. It is important that emergency service access suitable for Fire and Emergency personnel is provided at site boundaries, as well as provision for emergency egress by residents.	Add a new matter of discretion to LLRZ-S4 as follows: <u>x. The ability for emergency services to safely and efficient access the site.</u>	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential /	Robert Bell	4.2	Oppose	Opposes HMRZ chapter and zone to ensure property owners have confidence in their purchase, which might be jeopardised by the potential for neighbours to build three-storey buildings. Submitter states the zoning and provisions could be applied to new subdivisions only alternatively.	To delete mapping and provisions related to the Medium Density Residential Zone [Inferred relief]	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Assessment criteria /MRZ-AC1: Residential units (MRZ-R1); Relocated buildings (MRZ-R5); Retirement village premises (MRZ-R6)	Syeda Narjis Khurram	6.1	Oppose	Considers rule should remain same for all zones not isolated for few areas	Seeks there be only one zone and rules regardless of medium low and high [density residential] zone categories [Inferred relief requested]	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Ann Webster	8.1	Oppose	Opposes 3-storey dwellings in medium and high density residential zones, as they are intrusive and will become ugly, harder to maintain, and enables overlooking of other residents	Seeks that any buildings in existing suburbs should not be any taller than 2 storey, and only permit 3 storey dwellings in new subdivisions where prospective purchasers know that is in the plan for the area	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S8: Fences and walls	Ben Marsden	10.1	Oppose	Opposes MRZ-S8 to protect privacy and safety of pets and children, which also have a greater impact on corner sections.	Seeks to maintain the existing fence height standards.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S8: Fences and walls	Denise Ockey	13.1	Oppose	The proposal set out for lower fences (1.2m) is not private or practical for owners with dogs. The 1.8m requirement makes it the more logical option but it is still not private! Requiring 50% of the height being a visible material, the only types of material that would be capable of being structurally strong at 50% of the height would require it to be made of metal. This is simply not affordable for homeowners who are scrambling to afford to pay their rates as it is.	Requiring fences of 1.8m high to have 25% of the fence to have open visibility.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S8: Fences and walls	Craig Double	16.1	Oppose	Opposes the change on the basis that it will impact the ability of people who only have outdoor living space at the front of their home to utilise that space fully as there will be little privacy. Alternative options such as hedges will take years to grow. Higher fences help with blocking lights at night and noise.	Keep the current standard in the Operative District Plan.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Clare-Louise Gerbault	24.1	Amend	The submitter considers that MRZ provisions in areas such as Barker Road and Lowry Terrace will not necessarily manage amenity including a shortage of services.	Seeks that MRZ-O2: Community wellbeing is amended to reference consultation for multi-unit housing.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Clare-Louise Gerbault	24.2	Amend	The submitter considers that the current drafting of MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity is inconsistent with Objective MRZ-O2. Nos. 3 and 5 Lowry Terrace as early State Houses have historic heritage values.	Seeks that MRZ-O4 is amended to delete reference to "low rise apartments" and "terraced housing".  Amend MRZ to exclude Nos. 3 and 5 Lowry Terrace from the application of Medium Density Residential Zone Standards.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P3: Quality living environments - adjoining sites	Clare-Louise Gerbault	24.3	Amend	The submitter considers that MRZ-P3: Quality living environments - adjoining sites should be amended to include reference to only single storey dwellings of three per section.	Seeks that MRZ-P3 include specific mention of "only single storey dwellings of three per section".	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S8: Fences and walls	Susan Dallas	25.3	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O1: Housing supply and diversity	Forster Carl	30.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes MRZ chapter provisions in areas such as Trinity Crescent.	Delete MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) Chapter as notified.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S8: Fences and walls	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.3	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Jan Robertson	43.1	Oppose	Considers the MRZ will result in a loss of character, sunlight, privacy, social cohesion and increase noise and street parking.	Seeks deletion of MRZ-S1: Height and replacement with GRZ-S1: Height Standard.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential /	Andrea Logan	47.1	Oppose	The submitter considers that MRZ provisions in areas such as McDonald Street will not manage effects upon amenity, lack of parking and infrastructure with the new zoning not accounting for these factors.	Seeks that the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) is not enabled in McDonald Street.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S8: Fences and walls	Julie Chambers	53.3	Oppose	Considers Standard MRZ-S8: Fences and walls height limits are too low and will lead to a loss of privacy.	Seeks deletion of Standard MRZ-S8: Fences and walls.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure	carol taggart	54.1	Oppose	Considers the MRZ in Vigor Brown St will result in a lack of sunlight, amenity and exacerbate the existing parking shortfall and drainage infrastructure deficit and is at odds with MRZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure.	Seeks deletion of MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) from Vigor Brown St.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Iain Chisnell	55.1	Oppose	Considers the MRZ in King St PDP consultative and submission process is deficient. It will exacerbate parking, noise, amenity and the drainage infrastructure deficit and is contrary to MRZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure.	Seeks deletion of MRZ from King St.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /General /General	David Penman	56.1	Oppose	Considers that increasing the density of dwellings and population in King Street, north of Meeanee Road, will create traffic congestion and vehicle noise, and little to no on-site parking for these proposed dwellings will clog up Elbourne and King Street given the chicanes and street width.	Seeks consideration of onsite parking provisions for any dwellings in King and Elbourne Streets. Seeks consideration of how an increased car population leaving King Street (north side) will affect traffic flows on Meeanee Road, especially at peak times. Seeks specific provision for parking of Council vehicles on King Street (at the well) just back from Meeanee Road.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Sarah Zonneveld	59.1	Oppose	Opposes MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) provisions including MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity on McDonald Street. Considers that intensification will result in the loss of character / historic heritage housing, amenity and a lack of onsite parking will result in traffic effects and a lack of social cohesion	Seeks deletion of MRZ from McDonald Street and consideration instead of Historic Heritage Overlay status.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Sarah Zonneveld	59.2	Oppose	Opposes MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) provisions including MRZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure at McDonald Street. Considers that intensification will result in the loss of character / historic heritage housing, amenity and a lack of onsite parking will result in traffic effects and a lack of social cohesion.	Seeks deletion of MRZ from McDonald Street and consideration instead of Historic Heritage Overlay status.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Norm Zonneveld	60.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) provisions including MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity at McDonald Street. Considers that intensification will result in the loss of character / historic heritage housing, amenity and a lack of onsite parking will result in traffic effects and a lack of social cohesion.	Seeks deletion of MRZ from McDonald Street and consideration instead of Historic Heritage Overlay status.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /General /General	Amanda Jackson	66.1	Amend	The submitter considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in McDonald Street could result in a loss of character through poor residential design.	Amend the MRZ chapter and resource consent process with consultation / notification of neighbouring owners and design guidance provisions ensuring that development responds to site context.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Lesley Blair	68.1	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Coverdale Street without consultation of affected properties will result in the MRZ-S1: Height limits standard that is too high and will adversely affect amenity for the street.	Seeks deletion of MRZ from Coverdale Street.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S5: Building coverage	Craig Chambers	69.1	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) intensification (including MRZ-S5: Building coverage standard) provisions in Kennedy Road, Onekawa will result in a loss of existing property values, exacerbate infrastructural deficits, and onsite parking.	Seeks deletion of MRZ from Kennedy Road, Onekawa.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission



# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential /General	Glen McLeod Anne McLeod	74.1	Amend	<p>considers that Taradale is not an appropriate location for densification for the following reasons:</p> <p>first priority for the council should be restoring the water issue completely and completely Cyclone Gabrielle restoration to ensure there are no further flood events</p> <p>Taradale has a significant number of vulnerable elderly, young children, with play centres and schools off Peddie St. Adding further housing will turn Peddie into a major through-way with non-stop traffic creating safety issues which should be a priority.</p> <p>Infrastructure is already at peak with traffic on Lee St, Meeanee Rd, and Guppy at capacity during peak travel times. There is no capacity for additional traffic.</p> <p>Community has had no input and will lose property value, privacy, sunlight, and community feel. This is unacceptable.</p> <p>Increased noise will negatively impact a reasonably peaceful area.</p>	seeks to amend to remove Taradale from medium density zone. focus intensification on areas such as Marewa, Maraenui, and Ahuriri instead. Build upwards on existing sites in Taradale CBD to create additional commercial space.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Jonathan Mumford	75.1	Oppose	<p>Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) at 1/1 Peddie Street, 50 D Puketapu Road, Taradale and Greenmeadows villages will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, road reserve greenspace, business and commercial demand, poor residential design and a lack of social cohesion. MRZ Standards such as MRZ-S1 height limits are too high and will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increased street parking, vehicle movements, congestion, pollution, impervious areas, noise, inadequate infrastructure, depopulation, natural hazard risk. Greenfield land should be used for development instead.</p>	Inferred relief sought to delete MRZ and HRZ provisions (including MRZ-S1: Height) from Taradale, Greenmeadows and Napier City and reconsider development locations.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S3: Front yards	Jonathan Mumford	75.3	Oppose	<p>Considers that in the MRZ, 1.5m front yard setbacks undermine street amenity and increase impervious areas.</p>	Inferred relief sought - Opposes MRZ-S3: Front yards as notified. No specific relief sought	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P4: Quality living environments - within the site	Jonathan Mumford	75.4	Oppose	<p>Opposes MRZ-P4: Quality living environments - within site and considers it unlikely to be feasible due to the preclusion of car parking requirements in the NPS-UD alongside residential intensification which will lead to increased demand for street parking, vehicle movements, congestion, pollution and traffic safety.</p>	Inferred relief sought to delete MRZ-P4 (Quality living environments - within the site) as notified. No specific relief sought	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Jonathan Mumford	75.5	Oppose	<p>Considers that existing ageing infrastructure is inadequate for intensification. Greenfield intensification is preferable to developing the existing suburbs of Taradale and Greenmeadows and gives residents choice.</p>	Inferred relief sought to delete MRZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure as it is contrary to the MRZ intensification provisions that will result in a loss of public health and environmental wellbeing in Taradale, Greenmeadows and Napier City given the infrastructural deficit. Consider alternative locations instead.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Rick Neil Jamieson	77.2	Oppose	<p>Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and around Taradale, Greenmeadows will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, Peddie Street property values and result in commercial building bulk and form typologies. MRZ Standards such as MRZ-S1 height limits are too high and will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increased noise to 70db all night, street parking pressure and more vehicle movements.</p>	<p>Seeks that Peddie Street, Taradale and Greenmeadows are exempt from intensification in the MRZ and HRZ as notified.</p> <p>(Inferred relief requested)</p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Rick Neil Jamieson	77.3	Oppose	<p>Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale, Greenmeadows will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, existing Peddie Street property values and result in commercial building typologies. MRZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure is contrary to the MRZ intensification provisions that will result in an unreasonable standard of amenity with noise, street parking and vehicle movement increases.</p>	<p>Delete RZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure as being contrary to the MRZ intensification provisions that will instead result in a loss of public health and environmental wellbeing in Peddie Street, Taradale and Greenmeadows.</p> <p>(Inferred relief requested)</p>	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O3: Quality living environments	Rick Neil Jamieson	77.4	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street, Taradale and Greenmeadows will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, existing (No. 37) Peddie Street property value and result in commercial building typologies. MRZ and HRZ Objectives such as MRZ-O3: Quality living environments are inconsistent with an inferior standard of amenity arising from increases in noise, street parking and vehicle movements.	Seeks that Peddie Street, Taradale, Greenmeadows are deleted from MRZ and HRZ intensification as notified.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Rick Neil Jamieson	77.6	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Peddie Street, Taradale, Greenmeadows will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, existing (No. 37) Peddie Street property value and result in commercial building typologies. MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity is not achievable with MRZ intensification creating an unreasonable standard of amenity resulting from increased noise to 70dB all night, street parking and vehicle movements.	Seeks Peddie Street, Taradale, Greenmeadows deletion from intensification in the MRZ and HRZ as notified.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /MRZ-R1A	Peter Grant	78.4	Amend	Amend objectives to incentivize developers to meet requirements for Universal Design for older residents. Consider enabling a greater site coverage where Universal Design Standards are met.	Amend objectives to incentivize developers to meet requirements for Universal Design for older residents. Consider enabling a greater site coverage where Universal Design Standards are met.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies	Peter Grant	78.6	Amend	Supports safe and accessible parking areas in medium density developments.	Amend to explicitly include requirements for Mobility car and scooter parking	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies	Peter Grant	78.8	Amend	Supports enabling greater housing diversity to meet the needs of growing older populations, with choices near services and amenities. Considers the option for medium and high density zones dedicated for older people with communal areas. Considers choices needs to use Crime Prevention Through Safer Environmental Design principles for connection and safety. (Refer original submission for case study)	Amend policies to incentivize developers to meet requirements for Universal Design for older residents. Consider enabling a greater site coverage where Universal Design Standards are met.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S8: Fences and walls	Peter Grant	78.17	Support	Supports the proposed standards for fences and walls. Safety and visibility from and to the street are important for older people, particularly for those living alone. Social connections within neighbourhoods are important and lower fence heights go some way towards achieving this. Passive surveillance of the streetscape also helps with crime prevention.	Incorporate design guidelines to ensure utilisation of appropriate fence design and products.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Issues	Matthew Morley	82.1	Amend	Opposes the zoning of 156 Gloucester Street, Taradale (Taradale RSA) as Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ). Instead seeks the property is zoned Neighbourhood Centre Zone (NCZ) to better reflect the existing land uses.	Seeks to amend the zone of 156 Gloucester Street, Taradale (Taradale RSA) to Neighbourhood Centre Zone (NCZ)	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Karen Shields	86.1	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of Kennedy Road and Onekawa as a Medium Density Residential Zone and lack of minimum parking requirement due to the impact on parking and traffic congestion. Also considers the negative impact on the character of the suburb, sunlight, and privacy.	Delete Medium Density Zones in the suburbs of Marewa, Onekawa, and Pirimai.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Odette Charlotte Potgieter Henry George Potgieter	90.1	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, existing property values, historic heritage (original farmhouses at the top of Peddie Street, Art Deco houses at 2, 38c, 42 Peddie Street), lower special needs accessibility and result in commercial building typologies. MRZ and HRZ Standards such as MRZ-S1, HRZ-S1 height limits are too high and together with a lack of carparking and 1.5m front yard setbacks will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with noise, street parking, vehicle movement, congestion, emissions, infrastructure deficits, animal overcrowding, loss of greenspace, increased natural hazards risk.	Seeks consultation with residents and that Peddie Street and Taradale are exempt from intensification in the MRZ and HRZ as notified.	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-03: Quality living environments	Odette Charlotte Potgieter Henry George Potgieter	90.4	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, existing No. 40A Peddie Street property value and result in commercial building typologies. MRZ and HRZ Objectives such as MRZ-03: Quality living environments are inconsistent with a lack of carparking and 1.5m front yard setbacks that will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with noise, street parking, vehicle movement, congestion, exacerbating infrastructure deficits and loss of greenspace in road reserves and properties.	Seeks consultation with residents and that Peddie Street and Taradale are exempt from intensification in the MRZ and HRZ as notified.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-04: Neighbourhood character and identity	Odette Charlotte Potgieter Henry George Potgieter	90.6	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, existing No. 40A Peddie Street property value and result in commercial building typologies. MRZ-04: Neighbourhood character and identity is inconsistent with MRZ intensification resultant lack of carparking and 1.5m front yard setbacks that will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with noise, street parking, vehicle movement, congestion, exacerbating infrastructure deficits and loss of greenspace in road reserves and individual properties.	Seeks consultation with residents and that Peddie Street and Taradale are exempt from intensification in the MRZ and HRZ as notified.  (Inferred relief sought)	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-02: Community wellbeing	Odette Charlotte Potgieter Henry George Potgieter	90.7	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale will result in a loss of accessibility to essential services. MRZ-02: Community wellbeing is inconsistent with MRZ intensification resultant lack of carparking, inadequate public transport, increased vehicle movement, special needs and different individual accessibility and familial requirements. It risks community wellbeing through the loss of neighbourhood character and amenity.		Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Rosemary Anne Kirby Gregory John Kirby	91.2	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, Peddie Street property values and result in commercial building typologies. MRZ Standards such as MRZ-S1 height limits are too high and will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increased noise to 70db all night, street parking and vehicle movements.	Seeks consultation with residents and that Taradale is exempt from intensification in the MRZ as notified.(Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-04: Neighbourhood character and identity	Rosemary Anne Kirby Gregory John Kirby	91.3	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, existing Peddie Street property value and result in commercial building typologies. MRZ-04: Neighbourhood character and identity is contrary to MRZ intensification provisions and an unreasonable standard of amenity with noise, street parking and vehicle movement increases.	Seeks consultation with residents and that Taradale is exempt from intensification in the MRZ and HRZ as notified.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Ross Dobbie Eileen Dobbie	92.2	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street, Taradale and Greenmeadows will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, Peddie Street property values and result in commercial building typologies. MRZ Standards such as MRZ-S1 height limits are too high and will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increased noise to 70db all night, street parking and vehicle movements. Greenfield land should be used for development instead.	Seeks consultation with residents and that MRZ and HRZ provisions are deleted from Peddie Street, Taradale and Greenmeadows.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-04: Neighbourhood character and identity	Ross Dobbie Eileen Dobbie	92.3	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale, Greenmeadows will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, existing Peddie Street property values and result in commercial building typologies. MRZ-04: Neighbourhood character and identity is contrary to MRZ intensification provisions and will result in an unreasonable standard of amenity with noise, street parking and vehicle movement increases. Develop vacant greenfield land instead.	Seeks consultation with residents and that Peddie Street, Taradale, Greenmeadows are exempt from intensification in the MRZ and HRZ as notified.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Ross Dobbie Eileen Dobbie	93.2	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (High Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street, Taradale and Greenmeadows will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, Peddie Street property values and result in commercial building typologies. MRZ Standards such as MRZ-S1 height limits are too high and will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increased noise to 70db all night, street parking and vehicle movements. Greenfield land should be used for development instead.		Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Ross Dobbie Eileen Dobbie	93.3	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale, Greenmeadows will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, existing Peddie Street property values and result in commercial building typologies. MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity is contrary to MRZ intensification provisions and will result in an unreasonable standard of amenity with noise, street parking and vehicle movement increases. Develop vacant greenfield land instead.	Seeks consultation with residents and that Peddie Street, Taradale, Greenmeadows are exempt from intensification in the MRZ and HRZ as notified  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Cameron David Marett	98.2	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, Peddie Street property values and result in commercial building typologies. MRZ Standards such as MRZ-S1 height limits are too high and will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increased noise to 70db all night, no carparking requirements and vehicle movements resulting in congestion and disruption to the transport hierarchy.	Seeks that MRZ and HRZ provisions are deleted in their entirety from Peddie Street and Taradale.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P6: Non-residential activities	Cameron David Marett	98.3	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy and existing Peddie Street property values. MRZ-P6: Non-residential activities limiting is contrary to MRZ intensification that will result in an unreasonable standard of amenity with commercial building typologies.	Delete MRZ and HRZ in its entirety in Peddie Street and Taradale including MRZ-P6: Non-residential activities provisions.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O3: Quality living environments	Cameron David Marett	98.4	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, depreciation of the existing No. 32 Peddie Street property value and result in commercial building typologies. MRZ and HRZ Objectives such as MRZ-O3: Quality living environments are inconsistent with a lack of carparking that will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with noise, street parking (given there is no allowance for intensification), vehicle movements, congestion and exacerbation of ageing infrastructure deficits.	Seeks that Peddie Street and Taradale are exempt from intensification in the MRZ and HRZ as notified.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O3: Quality living environments	Cameron David Marett	98.5	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, existing No. 32 Peddie Street property value and result in commercial building typologies. MRZ and HRZ Objectives such as MRZ-O3: Quality living environments are inconsistent with a lack of reduced sunlight and privacy that will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity together with noise, street parking, vehicle movement, congestion, exacerbating historical infrastructure deficits.	Delete MRZ and HRZ provisions in their entirety from Peddie Street and Taradale.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Cameron David Marett	98.8	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale will result in an unreasonable standard of amenity with noise, street parking, vehicle movement increases, deficient infrastructure, loss of privacy, and resultant commercial building typologies. MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity is contrary to the MRZ intensification provisions and will result in a loss of neighbourhood character and existing 32 Peddie Street property value.	Seeks deletion of MRZ and HRZ from Peddie Street and Taradale.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Cameron David Marett	98.9	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale will result in an unreasonable standard of amenity with noise, street parking, vehicle movement increases and resultant commercial building typologies. MRZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure is contrary to the MRZ intensification provisions that will result in a loss of public health and environmental wellbeing given the infrastructural deficit.	Seeks deletion of Peddie Street and Taradale from MRZ and HRZ intensification as notified.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential /	Kevan Rasell	100.1	Oppose	Opposes MRZ intensification at 2A Harpham Street, Taradale that would enable multi-unit three storey housing on a neighbouring property creating shading for winter solar gains and privacy issues. Considers that there would be significant costs related to intensification including a lack of notification of neighbouring properties that should be addressed by Council.	Seeks that consultation / notification of multi-unit developments is required for neighbouring properties to enable design input.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /	Summerset Group Holdings Limited Summerset Group Holdings Limited	103.7	Amend	Considers that the objectives does not acknowledge the retirement villages significant accommodation/housing typology that contributes to the provision of a diverse range of housing demands, community wellbeing, and service freeing up land vacated by the elderly population when moving into a retirement village.Considers that the provisions fail to appropriately distinguish and recognise the functional and operational attributes of retirement villages.Considers that the PDP could better align with NPSUD in providing for a range of housing types, including the specific needs of older persons in a way which is more enabling, relative to the characteristics and requirements of retirement village activities through intensification in the existing urban environment.	Add retirement-village specific objective, policy and rule framework for each of the residential zones to better address the NPSUD to enable the provision of a diverse range of retirement housing and care options in the District.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /	Summerset Group Holdings Limited Summerset Group Holdings Limited	103.8	Amend	Considers that the policies does not acknowledge the retirement villages significant accommodation/housing typology that contributes to the provision of a diverse range of housing demands, community wellbeing, and service freeing up land vacated by the elderly population when moving into a retirement village. Considers that the provisions fail to appropriately distinguish and recognise the functional and operational attributes of retirement villages. Considers that the PDP could better align with NPSUD in providing for a range of housing types, including the specific needs of older persons in a way which is more enabling, relative to the characteristics and requirements of retirement village activities through intensification in the existing urban environment.	Add retirement-village specific objective, policy and rule framework for each of the residential zones to better address the NPSUD to enable the provision of a diverse range of retirement housing and care options in the District.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /MRZ-R6: Retirement village premises	Summerset Group Holdings Limited Summerset Group Holdings Limited	103.9	Amend	supports the restricted discretionary activity classification for 'Retirement village premises' in the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Amend to clarify, seperate and focus matters of discretion on the effects of retirement villages considering the efficient use of large sites in meeting the needs of retirement villages in effects assessments  Seeks retirement village activities are precluded from being notified on a public or limited basis.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /	Summerset Group Holdings Limited Summerset Group Holdings Limited	103.10	Amend	Considers the proposed standards inappropriate for residential villages considering the provision of communal amenities.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential outlook space;</li> <li>• Minimum residential unit size;</li> <li>• Outdoor living space;</li> <li>• Windows to the street;</li> <li>• Landscaped area;</li> <li>• Maximum building length.</li> </ul>	Seeks deletion of application of the following standards for retirement villages <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>Residential outlook space;</del></li> <li>• <del>Minimum residential unit size;</del></li> <li>• <del>Outdoor living space;</del></li> <li>• <del>Windows to the street;</del></li> <li>• <del>Landscaped area;</del></li> <li>• <del>Maximum building length.</del></li> </ul> Seeks amendment to provide specific standards and specific assessment framework for retirement villages which also consider the location of this activity on large sites allow for amenities different to that os standard residential dwelling.	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Assessment criteria /MRZ-AC1: Residential units (MRZ-R1); Relocated buildings (MRZ-R5); Retirement village premises (MRZ-R6)	Summerset Group Holdings Limited Summerset Group Holdings Limited	103.11	Amend	Considers it inappropriate for retirement villages to be subject to the same assessment matters/criteria as general residential developments, which exceed one unit per site, or for retirement villages to be subject to the same 'standards' that apply to residential units	Seeks amendment to provide specific standards and specific assessment framework for retirement villages which also consider the location of this activity on large sites allow for amenities different to that of a standard residential dwelling.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Issues /	Summerset Group Holdings Limited Summerset Group Holdings Limited	103.12	Amend	The demand for retirement village accommodation outstrips supply. The release of family homes back into the housing market annually through new retirement village builds represents a significant contribution to easing the chronic housing shortage. Considers that the PDP could better align with NPSUD in providing for a range of housing types, including the specific needs of older persons in a way which is more enabling, relative to the characteristics and requirements of retirement village activities through intensification in the existing urban environment. Also considers that the PDP could provide opportunity for such development/activity through rezoning by identifying greenfield land that is suitable for urban development by providing for a 'Future Urban Zone' framework. Refer to original submission for full reasons in attachment	No specific relief stated. Refer to original submission for full reasons in attachment	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Introduction /	Summerset Group Holdings Limited Summerset Group Holdings Limited	103.14	Amend	Considers that the introduction does not acknowledge the retirement villages significant accommodation/housing typology that contributes to the provision of a diverse range of housing demands, community wellbeing, and service freeing up land vacated by the elderly population when moving into a retirement village .  Considers that the PDP could better align with NPSUD in providing for a range of housing types, including the specific needs of older persons in a way which is more enabling, relative to the characteristics and requirements of retirement village activities through intensification in the existing urban environment. Also considers that the PDP could provide opportunity for such development/activity through rezoning by identifying greenfield land that is suitable for urban development by providing for a 'Future Urban Zone' framework.	No specific relief stated. To add retirement-village specific objective, policy and rule framework for each of the residential zones to better address the NPSUD to enable the provision of a diverse range of retirement housing and care options in the District [Inferred Relief].  Refer to full submission attachment for reasons	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /MRZ-R1: Residential units and residential activity	Andrea Millar	105.12	Support	Supports the permitted activity rules applying to "residential units" and "residential activity" in the zone as appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided by Ara Poutama.	Retain permitted activity rule MRZ-R1 applying to "residential units" and "residential activity" in the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Lynette Harris	106.2	Amend	Submitter objects to the proposed changes in the PDP. Submitter was born in Napier and has lived on Peddie Street for many years, is a pensioner who has made alterations to their home and enjoys living in the quiet peaceful and safe area.  Objects to, 19.5m high apartment blocks being built in Taradale and Greenmeadows, 12m high apartment blocks being built in Taradale and Greenmeadows, Commercial buildings being built in Taradale and Greenmeadows, No allowance for off street parking, Reduced privacy and sunlight, Increased vehicle movement, Increased noise to 70db all night; and The loss of neighbourhood character.  Submitter is stressed about their future and believes it is unnecessary as vacant land exists in Napier.	Considers plans unnecessary.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Lilian Sandra Winnie	107.2	Oppose	Opposes building height of 12m in Taradale.	No specific relief sought. Seeking amendment for a reduction in building height limited [Inferred].	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P6: Non-residential activities	Lilian Sandra Winnie	107.3	Oppose	Opposes commercial buildings being constructed in the Medium Density Residential Zone of Taradale.	No specific relief sought. Seeks to retain the non-complying activity status for non-residential activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone of Taradale [Inferred].	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Lilian Sandra Winnie	107.5	Oppose	Opposes this objective for seeking multi-storied units in Taradale.	No specific relief sought. Seeks amendment to the objective to discourage multi-unit development in Taradale. [inferred]	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S3: Front yards	Lilian Sandra Winnie	107.6	Oppose	Opposes 1.5m front yard setbacks for the reason of loss of green corridors along roads within private property.	No specific relief sought. Seeks an amendment to increase the required the front yard setback. [inferred]	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary	Lilian Sandra Winnie	107.9	Oppose	Opposes the proposed height in relation to boundary standards on the proviso that these standards will reduce privacy and sunlight on neighbouring properties.	No specific relief sought. Seeks amendment to height in relation to boundary standards to reduce shading on neighbouring properties (Inferred)	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Cameron David Marett	111.2	Oppose	Opposes the maximum height of 12m in the Medium Density Residential Zone in Taradale	No specific relief sought. Seeking amendment for a reduction in building height limited [Inferred].	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P6: Non-residential activities	Cameron David Marett	111.3	Oppose	Opposes commercial buildings being constructed in the Medium Density Residential Zone of Taradale.	No specific relief sought. Seeks to retain the non-complying activity status for non-residential activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone of Taradale [Inferred].	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Cameron David Marett	111.6	Oppose	Opposes this objective for seeking multi-storied units in Taradale.	No specific relief sought. Seeks amendment to the objective to discourage multi-unit development in Taradale. [inferred]	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Cameron David Marett	111.7	Oppose	Opposes the objective in whole for the reasons outlined in the submission.	Delete objective [inferred]	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /	Lawrence and Kerryn Yule	112.3	Amend	Considers that NCC should reflect the changes in Government and the announced Policy position that MRZ rules are to become voluntary and will be replaced with a requirement to zone 30 years of housing as an alternative. The low-lying nature of Napier and exposure to natural hazards means future expansion should be on the Western Hill rather than large urban areas being intensified.	Amend the MRZ to be voluntary.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Leighton Taylor	113.1	Oppose	Oppose the Proposed Napier District Plan (PDP) Medium Density Residential Zone also known as Medium Density Zone (MDZ / MRZ) change in Onekawa and Pirimai to protect historical significance, Onekawa North Plantation Reserve, loss of privacy, shade, visual impact, vehicle movements, current noise levels, neighbourhood character and more. Consider the need to account for Natural Hazards and liquefaction in low-lying areas, new Central government priorities, the implementation of Medium Density Residential Standards and existing opposition, and that neighbouring land owners should be notified.(Refer to original submission for further details.)	Delete the Medium Density Residential Zone also known as Medium Density Zone (MDZ / MRZ) change in Onekawa and Pirimai.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P5: Urban character	Philip Leake	116.2	Oppose	Oppose medium and high density housing in Napier South and 6 storey residential housing on Winifred Street, considering impacts to privacy, shade, safety and parking.	Retain current general residential settings of 1-2 storey's in Napier South and keep large areas of Bungalows and Villas in tact.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary	Angela Free	118.1	Oppose	The submitter considers that the average width between nos. 399-531 Marine Parade (less the 1m side boundary) is 8.12m which means that the maximum width for a second storey would be no more than 6m which is considered impractical.	Seeks that a 7.5m vertical height is instead provided before the recession plane starts as MRZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary will not achieve the MRZ Objectives and Policies.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S3: Front yards	Angela Free	118.2	Oppose	Considers that there should be no additional 0.5m front boundary set-back Standard (compared to the current 1m) as it is not the most appropriate way to achieve the MRZ objectives.	Delete MRZ-S3: Front yards as notified.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S8: Fences and walls	Angela Free	118.3	Oppose	The submitter opposes MRZ-S8: Fences and walls as unnecessary and the height too low with design as opposed to height and visual permeability playing a more significant role.	Delete MRZ-S8: Fences and walls as notified. Instead landowners should be able to choose 1.8m height and 25% visual transparency together with Council produced design guides.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S5: Building coverage	Angela Free	118.4	Oppose	Considers that Building Coverage of 50% is too restrictive and inefficient. Design and local greenspace context is more relevant with Marine Parade founded on pea metal (crushed rock) resulting in very effective stormwater absorption.	Opposes MRZ-S5: Building coverage as notified. Instead where within 100m of a large area of greenspace, the standard should be relaxed to 75%.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S7: Landscaped area	Angela Free	118.5	Oppose	The submitter opposes a random 20% Landscaped area figure as not being the most appropriate way to achieve the MRZ Objectives. Greenspace can occur at any height on a property including roof top gardens.	Delete MRZ-S7: Landscaped area as notified. Instead allow the 20% Landscaped area to be achieved at any height on a property through a mix of ground floor, first floor or rooftop patio.	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /MRZ-R1: Residential units and residential activity	Kate Graham	119.3	Amend	<p>Amend Rule MRZ-R1A to the match the equivalent permitted activity rule in the General Residential zone (GRZ-R1A) - one residential unit per site and include a new permitted activity rule (MRZ-R1B) which permits minor residential units in the Medium Density Residential zone with the same wording as GRZ-R3A. The reason for this requested amendment to MRZ-R1A and the addition of MRZ-R1B is the proposed high density zone currently comprises existing development – all new development in the Medium Density Residential zone is infill or brown fields development.</p> <p>Submits that existing residents should be able to build a minor dwelling – i.e. a granny flat on their existing properties as a permitted activity. As our population changes different types of brownfield development / growth will be required – this will include increasing multi generational living. By not allowing minor dwellings as a permitted activity within the Medium Density Residential zone multi generational living will be unachievable.</p>	<p>Amend Rule MRZ-R1A as follows:</p> <p>one residential unit per site.</p> <p><del>Note: Minor residential units are considered standard residential units subject to this rule within the Medium Density Residential Zone.</del></p> <p>and include a new permitted activity rule (MRZ-R1B - minor residential units) which reads:</p> <p><u>"Activity Status: Permitted</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>One minor residential unit per site, and</u></p> <p><u>1. The gross floor area of the unit does not exceed 80m<sup>2</sup>."</u></p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Shirley Rosina Carrington	121.5	Oppose	<p>Considers the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) and MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, depreciation of their existing No. 5 Peddie Street property value and result in commercial building typologies. MRZ Standards such as MRZ-S1 height limits are too high and will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with a loss of sunlight and privacy, increased street parking, vehicle movements, foot traffic, congestion, noise, inadequate infrastructure and the loss of openness.</p>	<p>Delete MRZ and HRZ provisions (including MRZ-S1: Height) from Peddie Street and Taradale as notified.(Inferred relief requested)</p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Shirley Rosina Carrington	121.8		<p>Considers the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) and MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, depreciation of the existing No. 5 Peddie Street property value and result in commercial building typologies. Objective MRZ-O2: Community wellbeing is inconsistent with a lack of personal safety, social wellbeing, connectivity, inequality, carparking that will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with noise, street parking (given there is no allowance for intensification), vehicle movements, foot traffic, congestion and exacerbation of existing infrastructural deficits.</p>	<p>Seeks Peddie Street and Taradale are exempt from intensification in the HRZ and MRZ as notified.</p> <p>(Inferred relief requested)</p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Edward Robert Woolman	122.1	Oppose	<p>Considers the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) and MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Elbourne Street and around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, trees, sunlight, privacy, greenspace, birdlife and sense of community. Objective MRZ-O2: Community wellbeing is inconsistent with the social mental and physical impacts upon residents (many of whom are pensioners) arising from an unreasonable standard of amenity due to the proposed intensification with increased density, population, noise, street parking pressure, congestion and people movements, wind and anti-social behaviour.</p>	<p>Seeks that Elbourne Street and Taradale are exempt from all intensification provisions (including Objective MRZ-O2: Community wellbeing) in the MRZ and HRZ as notified.</p> <p>(Inferred relief requested)</p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O3: Quality living environments	Edward Robert Woolman	122.3		<p>Considers the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) and MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Elbourne Street and around Taradale is inconsistent with Objective MRZ-O3: Quality living environments and the social mental and physical impacts upon local residents (many of whom are pensioners) arising from the loss of amenity and open space arising from an unreasonable standard of amenity due to the proposed intensification that will result in the loss of trees, sunlight, greenspace and birdlife (nature).</p>	<p>Delete MRZ and HRZ incompatible provisions (including MRZ-O3: Quality living environments) from Elbourne Street and around Taradale.</p> <p>(Inferred relief requested)</p>	Open Submission



# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Janet Anne Neill Abby Olivia Neill	127.1	Amend	Strongly object to the high and medium density residential zoning for King Street area. Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including King Street. Submitter has concerns of flooding (due to currently experienced inability for stormwater drains to not cope during high rainfall events) noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers these will impact the wellbeing of the community.	Relief Sought is not included, however it is inferred that the submitter seeks to have the area of Taradale around King Street reverted back to a General Residential Zone (not MRZ or HRZ).	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Janet Anne Neill Abby Olivia Neill	127.1	Amend	Strongly object to the high and medium density residential zoning for King Street area. Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including King Street. Submitter has concerns of flooding (due to currently experienced inability for stormwater drains to not cope during high rainfall events) noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers these will impact the wellbeing of the community.	Relief Sought is not included, however it is inferred that the submitter seeks to have the area of Taradale around King Street reverted back to a General Residential Zone (not MRZ or HRZ).	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Janet Anne Neill Abby Olivia Neill	127.2	Amend	Amend High Density Residential (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential (MRZ) for Taradale, particularly King Street. Submitter is opposed due to social impacts, on both health and well-being of residents. Is concerned about impacts on flooding, stormwater, noise, traffic, parking, green spaces, sunlight, privacy and loss of community. Particularly worried about risk of increased flooding, due to previous events in 2020 and 2023, considers the infrastructure doesn't seem to manage under pressure.	Relief Sought is not included, however it is inferred that the submitter seeks to have the area of Taradale around King Street reverted back to a General Residential Zone (not MRZ or HRZ).	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Janet Anne Neill Abby Olivia Neill	127.2	Amend	Amend High Density Residential (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential (MRZ) for Taradale, particularly King Street. Submitter is opposed due to social impacts, on both health and well-being of residents. Is concerned about impacts on flooding, stormwater, noise, traffic, parking, green spaces, sunlight, privacy and loss of community. Particularly worried about risk of increased flooding, due to previous events in 2020 and 2023, considers the infrastructure doesn't seem to manage under pressure.	Relief Sought is not included, however it is inferred that the submitter seeks to have the area of Taradale around King Street reverted back to a General Residential Zone (not MRZ or HRZ).	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Janet Anne Neill Abby Olivia Neill	127.3	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) particularly in the Taradale area including King Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers HRZ and MRZ will create a loss of nature, character, sunlight, privacy and community which will impact the wellbeing of residents.	Relief Sought is not included, however it is inferred that the submitter seeks to have the area of Taradale around King Street reverted back to a General Residential Zone (not MRZ or HRZ).	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Janet Anne Neill Abby Olivia Neill	127.3	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) particularly in the Taradale area including King Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers HRZ and MRZ will create a loss of nature, character, sunlight, privacy and community which will impact the wellbeing of residents.	Relief Sought is not included, however it is inferred that the submitter seeks to have the area of Taradale around King Street reverted back to a General Residential Zone (not MRZ or HRZ).	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Sandra Esther Wilson	129.5	Amend	Amend High Density Residential (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential (MRZ) for Taradale, particularly Elbourne Street. Submitter is opposed due to social impacts, on both health and well-being of residents. Considers impacts on noise, traffic, loss of green spaces, birdlife, character, sunlight, privacy, community, parking, anti-social behaviour, wind issues and the value of properties.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential /General	Kim Hunter	130.2	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) at 9A Peddie Street, Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, outlook, anticipatory decreased house values and a lack of personal safety. HRZ height limits for 6 storey apartments are too high and will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increased street parking, noise, vehicle movements and congestion. The submission process should be extended and simplified.	Delete HRZ and MRZ in their entirety for existing neighbourhoods and reconsider greenfield development locations with appropriate infrastructure.	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Andrea Furness	132.1	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) in Elbourne Street, Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy and sense of community. Objective MRZ-O2: Community wellbeing is inconsistent with the social mental and physical impacts upon residents (many of whom are pensioners) arising from an unreasonable standard of amenity due to the proposed intensification with increased density, population, noise, street parking pressure, congestion, natural hazards, wastewater and stormwater infrastructural deficits, social services pressure and anti-social behaviour.	Delete MRZ and HRZ provisions from Elbourne Street, Taradale.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Andrea Furness	132.2	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) in Elbourne Street, Taradale will result in a loss of sunlight, privacy and a sense of community. Objective MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity is inconsistent with the loss of neighbourhood character, loss of greenspace and birdlife that will ensue. There will also be social mental and physical impacts upon residents (many of whom are pensioners) arising from an unreasonable standard of amenity due to the proposed intensification with increased density, population, noise, street parking pressure, congestion, natural hazards, wastewater and stormwater infrastructural deficits, pressure on social services and higher rates of anti-social behaviour.	Seeks that Elbourne Street, Taradale are exempt from all intensification provisions (including Objective MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity) in the MRZ and HRZ as notified.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Andrea Furness	132.4	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) in Elbourne Street, Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character and result in commercial multi-storey and low-rise apartments incongruous building typologies. MRZ Standards such as MRZ-S1 height limits are too high and will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with a loss of sunlight and privacy, increased street parking, vehicle movements, congestion, noise, inadequate infrastructure and the loss of greenspace and birdlife.	Delete MRZ and HRZ provisions (including MRZ-S1: Height) from Elbourne Street, Taradale.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Andrea Furness	132.6	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) in Elbourne Street, Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character and result in multi-storey and low-rise apartments incongruous building typologies. MRZ Standards such as MRZ-S1 height limits are too high and will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with a loss of sunlight and privacy, increased street parking, vehicle movements, congestion and noise. There is already inadequate infrastructure in Elbourne Street that results in flooding with stormwater and wastewater left struggling to cope. Increased population will only exacerbate this.	Delete MRZ and HRZ provisions (including MRZ-S1: Height) from Elbourne Street, Taradale.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential /General	Deborah and Dennis Dinneen	133.1	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) at 79 McDonald Street, Napier South will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, outlook and a lack of personal safety due to possible antisocial behaviour. Height limits for 2-3 storey dwellings are too high and having relocated previously to avoid this eventuality will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increased street parking (given the added pressure of McLean Park events and rubbish), noise, vehicle movements and congestion. This part of Napier South was being examined as a heritage area.	Delete the MRZ provisions from McDonald Street, Napier South and maintain the existing zoning.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Deborah and Dennis Dinneen	133.2	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) at 79 McDonald Street, Napier South will result in a loss of neighbourhood character and heritage buildings and result in 2-3 storey building typologies instead which the submitters previously moved to get away from. MRZ Standards such as MRZ-S1 height limits are too high and will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with a loss of sunlight and privacy, increased street parking, vehicle movements, foot traffic, congestion, noise, inadequate infrastructure and the loss of openness.	Delete the MRZ provisions (including MRZ-S1: Height) from McDonald Street, Napier South and maintain the existing Operative Plan zoning.	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-03: Quality living environments	Deborah and Dennis Dinneen	133.3	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in McDonald Street, Napier South is inconsistent with Objective MRZ-03: Quality living environments and the impacts upon the like-minded community / local residents appreciative of the heritage character area (including pensioners) from the loss of amenity and open space arising from an unreasonable standard of amenity due to 2-3 storey built intensification that will result in the loss of sun, privacy and block light and invade quietness.	Delete MRZ incompatible provisions (including MRZ-03: Quality living environments) from McDonald Street, Napier South.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-04: Neighbourhood character and identity	Deborah and Dennis Dinneen	133.6	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in McDonald Street, Napier South is inconsistent with Objective MRZ-04: Neighbourhood character and identity and will instead result in an unreasonable standard of amenity with incompatible building bulk, location and form when compared with the existing street character that was being considered as a heritage area.	Delete MRZ incompatible provisions (including Objective MRZ-04: Neighbourhood character and identity) from McDonald Street, Napier South and instead maintain the Operative Plan status quo.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary	Alison Francis	139.5	Amend	Considers that the Plan has limited control to manage shading with a Medium Density Residential Standard (MDRS) 45 degree recession plane measured 4m vertically above ground level and development along the northern boundaries of neighbouring properties likely to make properties to the south susceptible to shading without amendment.	Amend MRZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary Standard as follows: 1. Buildings and structures must not project beyond a 45 degree recession plane measured from a point 4m vertically above ground level along side and rear boundaries. <u>Except for boundaries facing the southern half of a compass, where the buildings and structures must not project beyond a 45 degree recession plane measured from a point 3m above ground level.</u>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-02: Community wellbeing	Robina Anne Tipiwai	141.1	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers these will impact the wellbeing of the community.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-04: Neighbourhood character and identity	Robina Anne Tipiwai	141.2	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) particularly in the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers HRZ and MRZ will create a loss of nature, character, sunlight, privacy and community which will impact the wellbeing of residents.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-03: Quality living environments	Robina Anne Tipiwai	141.4	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /MRZ-R1: Residential units and residential activity	Pip Beachen	142.6	Support	Supports the retention of a Restricted Discretionary Activity Status where activity conditions are not met. Supports the default non-notification for applications under this rule on both a public and limited basis.	Retain Rule MRZ-R1.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Assessment criteria /MRZ-AC1: Residential units (MRZ-R1); Relocated buildings (MRZ-R5); Retirement village premises (MRZ-R6)	Pip Beachen	142.7	Oppose	Considers that the Hastings Residential Intensification Design Guide would introduce an additional layer of subjectivity and uncertainty if introduced into the statutory assessment process. Seeks that these should be retained as a non-statutory guidance document only, with resource consents to be assessed against the concise 'material' development criteria in the District Plan.	Delete Assessment Criteria MRZ-AC1(f) and (r). Retain remaining assessment criteria (a) – (e), (g) – (q) and (s).	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Pip Beachen	142.19	Support	Supports the maximum height limit of 12m for the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Retain MRZ-S1	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary	Pip Beachen	142.20	Amend	Considers that the height in relation to boundary of 4m + 45 degrees is too restrictive to allow for the efficient uptake of medium density residential development constructed up to a height of 12m. A 4m + 45 degree recession plane requires a three story building to be pushed off the boundary by 8m. Noting the width of most residential sites within Napier, this excludes a large portion of each lot and significantly reduces the buildable area. This is additionally exacerbated via the requirement to raise sites above flood levels applied by NCC. Seeks amendment so the height in relation to boundary line starts at the same level on the boundary as the minimum floor level applied to the site. Refers to approach in Christchurch District Plan ( See original plan for details). Also considers that the Height in Relation to Boundary provision does not consider duplex dwellings or terraced houses on adjacent sites which are sought to be enabled in the objectives and policies for the zone.	Amend to relax height in relation to boundary rules within the Medium Density Residential Zone to allow the efficient development of these sites. Consider conjoined duplex/terraced houses on separate lots whereby the height in relation to boundary standards are not required to be applied. Amend so that the height in relation to boundary plane is taken from the minimum floor level at the relevant boundary.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S4: Other yards	Pip Beachen	142.21	Amend	Supports a setback distance of 1m from side and rear boundaries however no provision is made for duplex or terrace housing typologies.	In order to give effect to Policy MRZ-P1, amend MRZ-S4 to remove the requirement to comply with yard setbacks between conjoined dwellings across boundaries.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S5: Building coverage	Pip Beachen	142.22	Support	Supports a building coverage of 50% within the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Retain MRZ-S5.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S6: Impervious area	Pip Beachen	142.23	Support	Supports an impervious area of 80% for the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Retain MRZ-S6.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S7: Landscaped area	Pip Beachen	142.24	Support	Supports a landscaped area of 20% for the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Retain MRZ-S7	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S8: Fences and walls	Pip Beachen	142.25	Support	Supports the retention of a fence and wall height of 2m within side and rear yards. Supports as significant fill required to be placed in residential sites to achieve minimum floor levels above flood hazards to provide for retaining and an adequate fence height above this retaining while still falling within the permitted height threshold.	Retain MRZ-S8.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S9: Garages and accessory buildings	Pip Beachen	142.26	Oppose	Opposes standard as notified as it has the potential to significantly restrict the ability to provide two-three level terraced houses facing the street, which may limit the viability of achieving this form. Also considers that the standard will produce generic outcomes providing for facades with no modulation. Design assessment criteria can address the relationship of multiple dwellings to the street without requiring this restrictive control.	Delete MRZ-S9.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S10: Windows to the street	Pip Beachen	142.27	Amend	Opposes this standard as it is currently worded. Considers that as street facing dwellings typically contain a garage (which can occupy up to 50% of a street facing façade), requiring 20% of glazing to then occupy the remaining portion of frontage would compromise the insulation and energy efficiency goals sought by the Building Code (noting that 40% of this area would require glazing). Notes the requirement for passive surveillance and streetscape connectivity, however considers that the requirement for 20% glazing of the full façade is not appropriate in situations where there is a street facing garage. For multi-unit developments, the assessment criteria will apply in addition to the standard therefore further flexibility is sought.	Amend the standard to only require 20% of the façade beyond any area occupied by a garage door to be in glazing.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S11: Outdoor living space	Pip Beachen	142.28	Oppose	Opposes the wording of MRZ-S11(3) and seeks further clarity around the interpretation of this standard.	Amend or delete MRZ-S11(3) as further clarity is required.	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S12: Residential outlook space	Pip Beachen	142.29	Oppose	Opposes standard as notified. Considers that the requirement for a principle living room of 6m by 4m is more onerous than what is required for the outdoor living space of 20m2 and a minimum dimension of 3m and therefore these provisions do not align in terms of achieving optimal site layout. Opposes the requirement for a 3m by 3m outlook space for all other habitable rooms as this will effectively require all dwellings to be pushed off the boundary by 3m which is more onerous than the 1m setback requirement and is not practical.	Amend so that the outlook space for a principle living room is amended to better align with the requirements of outdoor living space. Also amend so that the outlook space for all other rooms is reduced to 1m by 1m to enable flexibility in site design and alignment with the side and rear yard standards.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S13: Minimum residential unit size	Pip Beachen	142.30	Support	Supports the minimum residential unit sizes notified.	Retain MRZ-S13.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S14: Maximum building length	Pip Beachen	142.31	Oppose	Opposes the standard in its current form and recommends that it needs to be rewritten to achieve a better outcome and avoid inefficient development on sites. Requiring a break in the building reduces the effective building area on a site. Considers that the assessment criteria for multi-unit developments can adequately address building bulk.	Amend the standard to remove the requirement for building separation and instead require architectural relief for 4m of the building to break up the continuous length; or delete the standard and utilise assessment criteria to assess design matters.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /General	Pip Beachen	142.54	Support	Supports the standards of the General Residential Zone, Medium Density Residential Zone, and the High Density Residential Zone, except where otherwise stated through specific submission points. Considers that it is important that the standards appropriately facilitate the outcomes sought by Council for the City and further enable efficient development of sites while achieving onsite amenity and maintain an appropriate and transparent standard of amenity for adjacent residents. Seeks to ensure that the standards across the relevant zones (GRZ, MRZ, HRZ) are workable and provide for practical outcomes when actually implemented onsite.	Retain standards in the GRZ, MRZ and HRZ except where amendments are sought through separate submission points.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /General	Pip Beachen	142.56	Amend	Considers that it is important that the standards appropriately facilitate the outcomes sought by Council for the City and further enable efficient development of sites while achieving onsite amenity and maintain an appropriate and transparent standard of amenity for adjacent residents. Seeks to ensure that the standards across the relevant zones (GRZ, MRZ, HRZ, MUZ) are workable and provide for practical outcomes when actually implemented onsite.	Seeks that standards across the relevant zones (GRZ, MRZ, HRZ, MUZ) are workable and provide for practical outcomes when actually implemented onsite. Seeks Amendments or the removal of standards which are overly onerous for residential development or which result in contradicting outcomes to other standards, therefore seeking a consistent approach within each Zone and across the Plan.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Shana Jessie Marie Cochrane	144.1	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including King Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers these will impact the wellbeing of the community.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Shana Jessie Marie Cochrane	144.2	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) particularly in the Taradale area including King Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers HRZ and MRZ will create a loss of nature, character, sunlight, privacy and community which will impact the wellbeing of residents.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O3: Quality living environments	Shana Jessie Marie Cochrane	144.4	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including King Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	William Nunes	145.1	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers these will impact the wellbeing of the community.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	William Nunes	145.2	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) particularly in the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers HRZ and MRZ will create a loss of nature, character, sunlight, privacy and community which will impact the wellbeing of residents.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-03: Quality living environments	William Nunes	145.4	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential /General	Ethel Kearns	146.5		Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Introduction	Sera Chambers	150.1	Amend	Amend to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone on the following basis:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- historical significance of roads in these areas</li> <li>- government intending to legislate for medium density to become optional for councils</li> <li>- will not enhance amenity values and will affect environmental characteristics</li> <li>- awareness of the change is lacking</li> <li>- current strategic direction does not take into account natural hazards including recent events</li> <li>- reported incidents of opposition to intensification</li> <li>- risk of medium density include increased strain on infrastructure, reduced privacy and sunlight, more noise, loss of character, legal consequences that can affect quality of life and wellbeing</li> <li>- cons of high population density include limited resources, increased levels of pollution, social problems, and pressure on natural environment</li> </ul> Affected and adjoining landowners should maintain the right to have their say on what will happen in their community and the PDP is proposing to take	seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Introduction /	Sera Chambers	150.2	Amend	Amend to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Issues	Sera Chambers	150.3	Amend	amend to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives	Sera Chambers	150.4	Amend	amend to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives	Sera Chambers	150.5	Amend	amend to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives	Sera Chambers	150.6	Amend	amend to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives	Sera Chambers	150.7	Amend	amend to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies	Sera Chambers	150.8	Amend	amend to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies	Sera Chambers	150.9	Amend	amend to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies	Sera Chambers	150.10	Amend	amend to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies	Sera Chambers	150.11	Amend	Considers Onekawa and Pirimai should be excluded by way of an amendment from the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) in the PDP.	Seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) by way of amendment.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies	Sera Chambers	150.12	Amend	Considers Onekawa and Pirimai should be excluded from the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) by way of an amendment.	Seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) through amendment.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies	Sera Chambers	150.13	Amend	Considers Onekawa and Pirimai should be removed from the Medium Density Residential Zone by an amendment.	Seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ).	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies	Sera Chambers	150.14	Amend	Considers it necessary to amend the PDP to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the (MRZ) Medium Density Residential Zone.	Seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Open Submission



# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table	Sera Chambers	150.36	Amend	amend to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table	Sera Chambers	150.37	Amend	amend to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table	Sera Chambers	150.38	Amend	amend to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Assessment criteria	Sera Chambers	150.39	Amend	amend to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Assessment criteria	Sera Chambers	150.40	Amend	amend to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Assessment criteria	Sera Chambers	150.41	Amend	Considers that an amendment is needed to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone and its provisions in the PDP in order to maintain people's property rights.	Seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ).	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Assessment criteria	Sera Chambers	150.42	Amend	Considers that Onekawa and Pirimai should be excluded from the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) and its provisions through an amendment to the Proposed Plan.	Seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ).	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Assessment criteria	Sera Chambers	150.43	Amend	Considers that there should be an amendment to the PDP to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone and its provisions.	Seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ).	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Assessment criteria	Sera Chambers	150.44	Amend	Considers that there should be an amendment to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai zoning together with its constituent provisions from the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ).	Seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ).	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Assessment criteria	Sera Chambers	150.45	Amend	Considers that Onekawa and Pirimai should be excluded from Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) zoning with its associated provisions through amendment to the PDP.	Seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ).	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Assessment criteria	Sera Chambers	150.46	Amend	Considers that Onekawa and Pirimai should be removed from the Medium Density Residential Zone and its provisions, including assessment criteria, through amendment to the PDP.	Seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ).	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Assessment criteria	Sera Chambers	150.47	Amend	Considers that Onekawa and Pirimai should be removed from the Medium Density Residential Zone and its associated provisions through amendment to the PDP in order to maintain people's property rights.	Seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ).	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Assessment criteria	Sera Chambers	150.48	Amend	Considers that Onekawa and Pirimai should be excluded from the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) and its associated provisions through an amendment to the PDP.	Seeks to exclude Onekawa and Pirimai from the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ).	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Marisa Mous	159.1	Oppose	Submitter opposes Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ). Has concerns about negative impacts on residents' enjoyment of their properties, due to light and parking.	Seeks to delete both HRZ and MRZ.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S8: Fences and walls	Marisa Mous	159.3	Oppose	Submitter opposes the proposed 1.2m height for boundary fences due to concerns of safety, quiet enjoyment of properties, privacy, and animal containment.	Retain current fence heights.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential /General	John Gillon	161.5		Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Dorothy Brunei Kelsey	162.1	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers these will impact the wellbeing of the community.	Relief Sought not included.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Dorothy Brunei Kelsey	162.2	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) particularly in the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers HRZ and MRZ will create a loss of nature, character, sunlight, privacy and community which will impact the wellbeing of residents.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O3: Quality living environments	Dorothy Brunei Kelsey	162.4	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission



# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Allan Thompson	163.1	Amend	Amend Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for Elbourne Street. Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) on the opposite side of Elbourne Street. Has concerns about the zones impact on traffic, noise, their right to consultation, property damage, privacy, sunlight and character of the area.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P7: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Allan Thompson	163.4	Amend	Amend Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) on Elbourne Street. Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) on the opposite side of Elbourne Street. Has concerns about the zones impact on traffic, noise, their right to consultation, property damage, privacy, sunlight and character of the area.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Allan Thompson	163.5	Amend	Amend Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) on Elbourne Street. Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) on the opposite side of Elbourne Street. Has concerns about the zones impact on traffic, noise, their right to consultation, property damage, privacy, sunlight and character of the area.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone / /	Ivan Yukich	166.1	Oppose	Opposes Medium Density Residential (MRZ). There has been no provision for off street parking. No consideration for McLean Park which utilises street parking, with intensification parking will be pushed further out. MRZ will detract from the Heritage value and resident's lifestyle. McDonald Street shows a high risk of liquefaction therefore should not be intensified as it creates a liability situation for stakeholders. Stormwater is an issue documented in recent flood events.	Seek to maintain current zoning for McDonald Street and surrounding streets.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Monique Charlotte Maria Van Groenewoud Raymond Mears	167.1	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers these will impact the wellbeing of the community.	Relief Sought is not included, however it is inferred that the submitter seeks that the zoning for the Taradale area around Elbourne Street to revert to General Residential Zone (not HRZ or MRZ).	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Monique Charlotte Maria Van Groenewoud Raymond Mears	167.2	Amend	Is strongly against the proposal to rezone their property and surrounding areas (Taradale) to High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ). Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers HRZ and MRZ will create a loss of nature, character, sunlight, privacy and community which will impact the wellbeing of residents.	Relief Sought is not included, however it is inferred that the submitter seeks that the zoning for the Taradale area around Elbourne Street to revert to General Residential Zone (not HRZ or MRZ).	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Monique Charlotte Maria Van Groenewoud Raymond Mears	167.5	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) particularly in the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community.	Relief Sought is not included, however it is inferred that the submitter seeks that the zoning for the Taradale area around Elbourne Street to revert to General Residential Zone (not HRZ or MRZ).	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S4: Other yards	Sheena McGuire	168.111	Amend	<p>Notes that the MRZ Chapter does not contain a specific rail corridor building setback standard. Instead, the rail corridor boundary is assessed as a side or rear yard site boundary and a 1m building setback applies.</p> <p>Considers that setbacks are a common planning tool used to ensure the safe and efficient operation of activities such as the railway corridor, particularly when it may come into conflict with adjacent land uses. For rail, a setback provides a safe physical distance between a building and the railway corridor boundary. Heavy freight trains run on the railway lines through the Napier City District. Considers that without a sufficient setback, people painting their buildings, clearing gutters or doing works on their roof will need to access or foul the rail corridor. If a person or object encroaches onto the rail corridor, there is a substantial risk of injury or death for the person entering the rail corridor. Considers that a setback control has obvious safety benefits for the users of the land adjoining the rail corridor and users of the rail corridor. Also notes the efficiency benefits for rail operations, mitigating against the risk of train services being interrupted by unauthorised persons or objects entering the rail corridor. Considers that without appropriate setback requirements, there is significant risk of adverse health and safety effects impacting people locating and working in proximity to the railway corridor.</p> <p>Seeks a new clause within MRZ-S4: Other yards to require a 5m setback for structures and buildings from the rail corridor. Matters of discretion are also sought in the case that the setback cannot be achieved.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No part of any building may be erected closer than 1 m to a side or rear site boundary unless: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. written approval of the adjacent landowner(s) is provided.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Any part of a building, fence, or structure must not be erected closer than 6 m from the top of the bank of any watercourse or open drain.</li> <li>3. <u>No part of any building or structure may be located within a 5m setback from a boundary shared with a rail corridor.</u></li> </ol> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Purpose of the standard;</li> <li>2. Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces;</li> <li>3. Quality living environments;</li> <li>4. Operation and maintenance of watercourses and open drains;</li> <li>5. <u>The safe and efficient operation of the rail network;</u></li> <li>6. <u>Compatibility with the surrounding environment; and</u></li> <li>7. The reason for the reduced setback.</li> </ol>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Edward Te Paki	175.1	Oppose	<p>Opposes Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ), due to a busier road, character, social impacts and noise.</p> <p>Houses here was built 1900 so will reflect character.</p>	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Edward Te Paki	175.3	Oppose	<p>Opposes Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ), due to a busier road, character, social impacts and noise.</p>	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /General	Susan Elaine Macdonald	178.6	Amend	<p>Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) to exclude Napier South and Marewa. 6 storey buildings would ruin the aesthetic of suburbs and have a detrimental effect on neighbouring properties. Has no issues with subdivisions along sections but has an issue with building up.</p> <p>Despite proposed upgrades of stormwater, submitter has concerns that stormwater run off from extra housing will overload stormwater infrastructure. Notes that 70% of Napier's stormwater runs into Ahuriri Estuary, housing infill will increase this.</p> <p>Regarding proposed new regional park concept at blue lagoon farm that will provide treatment, what does this mean? The concept must be the last resort to preventing contaminates within the estuary. More work and funding need to be allocated to preventing contaminants reaching Lagoon Farm.</p> <p>Notes that consents for buildings in HRZ and MRZ do not need to be notified. Asks that all consents are notifiable It shouldn't be the task of NCC to grant consent for High rise buildings without informing the neighbours. HRZ will have an impact on privacy and environment so everyone should have a say and be personally informed.</p> <p>Submitter supports the fencing rules for front facing fences. Wishes that fencing rules will apply to all new fences. This is due to submitters personal safety being deaf and a mobility user, cars cannot usually see them when pulling out. Fence rules will protect submitters safety.</p>	<p>Relief Sought is not included, however it is inferred that the submitter seeks that the proposal to rezone Napier South and Marewa HRZ and MRZ be rejected.</p> <p>It is also inferred that the submitter seeks that buildings within the HRZ and MRZ be notifiable.</p> <p>It is also inferred that the submitter seeks the approval of the proposal relating to front fences.</p>	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential /	Ben Hasselman	181.1	Amend	<p>Considers that there is an opportunity to become more actively involved in ensuring that housing stock meets the population needs, especially considering the requirements for the provision of housing that will accommodate people throughout every age and stage of their life. Currently there is a shortage of housing that can accommodate those with access needs and this will be intensified through allowing two- and three-story walk up residential builds, apartments and town housing being consented without the requirement for Universal Design or any reference to accessibility.</p> <p>While the PDP mentions providing a "range of housing types to meet the needs of our communities" neither this MRZ Section nor the s32 report refer to the accessibility / useability / Universal Design of the housing which is leaving a large gap in providing for the needs of our community.</p>	<p>Seeks to encourage Napier City Council to develop and adopt an initiative through an amendment that will provide an incentive to designers and developers to increase the number of Universally Designed / Lifemark homes being built through the district. Lifemark can support Napier City Council with exploring options that would be beneficial for the community.</p> <p>(The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)</p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O1: Housing supply and diversity	Ben Hasselman	181.2	Amend	<p>Considers that there is an opportunity to become more actively involved in ensuring that housing stock meets the population needs, especially considering the requirements for the provision of housing that will accommodate people throughout every age and stage of their life. Currently there is a shortage of housing that can accommodate those with access needs and this will be intensified through allowing two- and three-story walk up residential builds together with apartments and town housing being consented without the requirement for Universal Design or any reference to accessibility.</p> <p>While the PDP mentions providing a "range of housing types to meet the needs of our communities" neither this chapter nor the s 32 report refer to the accessibility / useability / Universal Design of the housing which is leaving a large gap in providing for the needs of our community.</p>	<p>Seeks to encourage Napier City Council to develop and adopt an amendment to the provision / s that will provide an incentive to designers and developers to increase the number of Universally Designed / Lifemark homes being built through the City / district. Lifemark can support Napier City Council with exploring options that would be beneficial for the community.</p> <p>(The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)</p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /MRZ-R1: Residential units and residential activity	Mervin Castelino	183.1	Oppose	Opposes Medium Density Residential Zone for Upham Crescent	Amend to consider density control or minimum lot size when resource consent for a medium density development is sought at the same time as subdivision.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /MRZ-R1: Residential units and residential activity	Angela McFlynn	189.48	Amend	<p>Considers precluding public or limited notification for any development of a residential site to contain more than 1 residential unit is not appropriate in MRZ-R1: Residential units and residential activity. Significant increases in density have the potential to have significant adverse effects on the surrounding residential area, and residents have a right to have their concerns considered when there are potential direct effects on the use and enjoyment of their property. The Council, through the District Plan should show respect for their community and allow for public and/or limited notification where appropriate.</p>	<p>Amend MRZ-R1: Residential units and residential activity as follows:</p> <p>Notification status: Any application under this rule is precluded from being notified on a public or limited basis <u>only if compliance with all of standards MRZS1-MRZS14 is achieved.</u></p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.16	Amend	<p>Further analysis on the appropriateness of each of the MDZ provisions in achieving the objectives of the zone is required, including having regard to the implementation of central government's medium density residential standards (MDRS) in Tier 1 areas (i.e. whether "quality living environments" (MRZ-O3) are achieved), and the feasibility of developing land for the intended typology under the standards (i.e. whether land is used efficiently for medium-density residential living (MRS-O1).</p>	<p>Consider amending to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MDRS standard of 4m + 60 degrees, Or</li> <li>- GRZ standard of 3m + 45 degrees</li> </ul>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S3: Front yards	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.17	Amend	<p>Further analysis on the appropriateness of each of the MDZ provisions in achieving the objectives of the zone is required, including having regard to the implementation of central government's medium density residential standards (MDRS) in Tier 1 areas (i.e. whether "quality living environments" (MRZ-O3) are achieved), and the feasibility of developing land for the intended typology under the standards (i.e. whether land is used efficiently for medium-density residential living (MRS-O1).</p>	Consider amending to 2.5m.	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S7: Landscaped area	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.18	Amend	Further analysis on the appropriateness of each of the MDZ provisions in achieving the objectives of the zone is required, including having regard to the implementation of central government's medium density residential standards (MDRS) in Tier 1 areas (i.e. whether "quality living environments" (MRZ-O3) are achieved), and the feasibility of developing land for the intended typology under the standards (i.e. whether land is used efficiently for medium-density residential living (MRS-O1).	Consider amending clause (1) to requiring a minimum of 35% landscaped area.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S11: Outdoor living space	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.19	Amend	The wording of this standard could be improved to achieve the intended outcome as stated in the purpose.	Amend wording to require outdoor living space to be directly accessible from a living area, and to confirm whether the 20sqm can be split into separate areas or is required to be provided in a single area. Also require outdoor living area to be a maximum gradient to ensure it is useable.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S12: Residential outlook space	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.20	Amend	This standard as currently drafted effectively requires all habitable rooms to be set back 3m from the boundary. This doesn't allow for flexibility in site design. Upper levels will necessarily be set back to comply with height in relation to boundary standards.  The wording of this standard could also be improved to achieve the intended outcome as stated in the purpose.	Consider amending standard to apply a 3m x 3m outlook from the principal bedroom, and 1m x 1m from all other habitable rooms.  Review wording to assist in implementation e.g. how/where it is measured from.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential /	A Davidson	197.2	Oppose	Opposes Medium Density Residential (MRZ) in any Napier suburb. Allowing such developments will blemish the landscape, reduce property values impact the character of neighbourhoods, and create challenges for residents. MRZ creates environmental and social challenges. Provides Carnell Street as example of HRZ 'gone wrong' with increased, crime, violence and property damage. Causing elderly to have concerns about their safety. Submitter has concerns about MRZ impacting sunlight, privacy, noise, and crime. It is unfair to inflict MRZ on homeowners and rate payers and will create undesirable neighbourhoods. Submitter has concerns about carparking and ability to sustain traffic. MRZ with no green area does not allow for a normal residential environment.	Seeks to amend plan and place MRZ out of city limits and not impact current neighbourhoods.  The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential /General	Scott Gould	199.1	Amend	Submitter wants to amend Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) and High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) as they are too broad and inconsiderate of Napier's character and its history. Many Art Deco homes are in proposed MRZ and HRZ.	Seeks to amend HRZ and MRZ to be restricted to very confined areas which can be incrementally expanded on in subsequent District Plan revisions.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Darryl Furness	200.1	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) especially the zoning of Elbourne street, due to directly impacting the submitter. Is against the proposal as due its impact on the health and wellbeing of residents.  Has concerns of increased noise, loss of character, increased traffic, parking, loss of trees and greenspace, sunlight, privacy, loss of community, increased anti-social behaviour, the capability of waste water systems, and liquefaction risk.  Also mentions the healthcare system and its ability to cope with an increased population. Such impacts will affect community wellbeing.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Darryl Furness	200.3	Amend	<p>Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) especially the zoning of Elbourne street, due to directly effecting the submitter. Is against the proposal as due its impact on the health and wellbeing of residents.</p> <p>Has concerns of increased noise, loss of character, increased traffic, parking, loss of trees and greenspace, sunlight, privacy, loss of community, increased anti-social behaviour, the capability of waste water systems, and liquefaction risk.</p> <p>Also mentions the healthcare system and its ability to cope with an increased population.</p> <p>Submitter opposes HRZ and MRZ as it will impact neighbourhood character and identity due to loss of sunlight, trees/greenspace, and privacy.</p>	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Darryl Furness	200.4	Amend	<p>Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) especially the zoning of Elbourne street, due to directly effecting the submitter. Is against the proposal as due its impact on the health and wellbeing of residents.</p> <p>Has concerns of increased noise, loss of character, increased traffic, parking, loss of trees and greenspace, sunlight, privacy, loss of community, increased anti-social behaviour, the capability of wastewater systems, and liquefaction risk.</p> <p>Also mentions the healthcare system and its ability to cope with an increased population.</p> <p>Height of buildings in MRZ will impact sunlight for residents affecting their health.</p>	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P5: Urban character	warren pearce	206.1	Oppose	<p>Opposes the introduction of medium and high density residential areas due to the downstream effects. Considers that the outdoor living space minimums are too low and would hard to development of children and the mental health of residents due to noise and privacy disturbances, and crime. Also considers the need for minimum parking requirements. Considers the negative impact of passive and active surveillance. Notes the loss of character in neighbourhoods and changing property values. (Refer to original submission for full reasons)</p>	Inferred request to remove the proposed medium and high density chapters to protect private property rights.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S11: Outdoor living space	warren pearce	206.3	Oppose	<p>Opposes the proposed outdoor living space standard as provisions are too small.</p>	(Not specified)	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /General	Georgina McPherson	215.119	Oppose	None of the objectives, policies or rules refer to reverse sensitivity effects. The Fuel Companies have a service station within the MRZ, and two service stations immediately adjacent to the MRZ. It is noted that the activities provided for within this zone may be sensitive to the effects of these existing lawfully established activities. The Fuel Companies seek that the reverse sensitivity effects are appropriately managed in this chapter.	<p>Add new objective and policy as follows:</p> <p><u>MRZ-OXX: Reverse sensitivity</u></p> <p><u>Existing non-residential activities are not unreasonably compromised by reverse sensitivity effects and/or incompatible activities in adjacent zones.</u></p> <p><u>MRZ-PXX: Reverse sensitivity</u></p> <p><u>Ensure that existing non-residential activities are not compromised by reverse sensitivity effects.</u></p> <p>Add new matters of discretion for rules MRZ-R1B, MRZ-R4B, MRZ-R6 and MRZ-R8 as follows:</p> <p>MRZ-R1B: Residential units and residential activity MRZ-R4B: Visitor accommodation</p> <p>MRZ-R6: Retirement village premises</p> <p>MRZ-R8 Activities infringing standards MRZ-S1 - MRZ-S11</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <p>...Reverse sensitivity effects on established adjacent land uses.</p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /General	Georgina McPherson	215.120	Oppose	None of the objectives, policies or rules refer to reverse sensitivity effects. The Fuel Companies have a service station within the MRZ, and two service stations immediately adjacent to the MRZ. It is noted that the activities provided for within this zone may be sensitive to the effects of these existing lawfully established activities. The Fuel Companies seek that the reverse sensitivity effects are appropriately managed in this chapter.	<p>Add new objective and policy as follows:</p> <p><u>MRZ-OXX: Reverse sensitivity</u></p> <p><u>Existing non-residential activities are not unreasonably compromised by reverse sensitivity effects and/or incompatible activities in adjacent zones.</u></p> <p><u>MRZ-PXX: Reverse sensitivity</u></p> <p><u>Ensure that existing non-residential activities are not compromised by reverse sensitivity effects.</u></p> <p>Add new matters of discretion for rules MRZ-R1B, MRZ-R4B, MRZ-R6 and MRZ-R8 as follows:</p> <p>MRZ-R1B: Residential units and residential activity MRZ-R4B: Visitor accommodation</p> <p>MRZ-R6: Retirement village premises</p> <p>MRZ-R8 Activities infringing standards MRZ-S1 - MRZ-S11</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <p>...Reverse sensitivity effects on established adjacent land uses.</p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P6: Non-residential activities	Georgina McPherson	215.121	Amend	The Fuel Companies are concerned that the direction in this policy applies to all non-residential activities, including existing lawfully established activities. They seek that this policy apply to new activities only.	<p>Amend MRZ-P6 as follows:</p> <p><u>MRZ-P6: Non-residential activities</u></p> <p><u>Limit new non-residential activities in the zone to:</u></p> <p>a. ....</p>	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /General	Georgina McPherson	215.122	Oppose	The MRZ rules do not provide for existing service stations activities, including any additions or alterations to the existing activity. As a result, any additions or alterations to the existing activity is a non-complying activity in the zone under rule MRZ-R9 (activities not otherwise provided for). This is overly restrictive for existing activities. To address this, the Fuel Companies seek a new discretionary activity for service stations, subject to it being an addition, alteration or rebuild to that activity. In addition, a consequential change is needed to the definition of 'alteration or addition' as the current definition relates only to heritage buildings or structures (this is addressed earlier in this submission in the definitions section).	Add new rule as follows:  <u>MRZ-RX: Service stations Activity status: Discretionary</u>  <u>Where:</u>  <u>1. The activity is an addition, alteration or redevelopment of an existing service station.</u>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-02: Community wellbeing	Shravan Miryala	217.59	Support	Supports intent of Objectives MRZ-02 and MRZ-03.	Retain Objectives MRZ-02 and MRZ-03 as notified.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-03: Quality living environments	Shravan Miryala	217.60	Support	Supports intent of Objectives MRZ-02 and MRZ-03.	Retain Objectives MRZ-02 and MRZ-03 as notified.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P4: Quality living environments - within the site	Shravan Miryala	217.61	Amend	Considers that the amenity of more sensitive activities, such as residential activities, will be better protected where they have been appropriately designed to manage reverse sensitivity effects where there is an interface with lawfully established non-residential activities. Seeks relief consistent with design principle 1: The Site of the National medium density design guide (Ministry for the Environment, May 2022) which seeks that current or proposed nearby non-residential activities are identified and that residential development responds to them.	Amend MRZ-P4 as follows:  Manage development to achieve a quality living environment for residents within the site, including by providing:  a. useable and accessible outdoor living space appropriate for the location and housing typology;  b. privacy;  c. access to sunlight;  d. functional living spaces;  e. storage, <del>and</del>  f. safe and accessible parking areas; and  g. managing reverse sensitivity at zone interfaces <u>and the interface between existing non-residential and noise-sensitive activities.</u>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P5: Urban character	Shravan Miryala	217.62	Amend	Considers that the amenity of more sensitive activities, such as residential activities, will be better protected where they have been appropriately designed to manage reverse sensitivity effects where there is an interface with lawfully established non-residential activities. Seeks relief consistent with design principle 1: The Site of the National medium density design guide (Ministry for the Environment, May 2022) which seeks that current or proposed nearby non-residential activities are identified and that residential development responds to them.	Amend MRZ-P5 as follows:  Achieve the planned medium-density built character of primarily two- to three-storey buildings surrounded by landscaping, including by:  a. limiting the height, bulk, and form of development;  b. managing the design and appearance of multi-residential unit development, <del>and</del>  c. requiring setbacks and landscaped areas that are consistent with an urban character., <u>and</u>  <u>d. managing reverse sensitivity at zone interfaces and the interface between existing non-residential and noise-sensitive activities.</u>	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P6: Non-residential activities	Shravan Miryala	217.63	Amend	Considers that proposed wording in the policy does not consider existing lawfully established non-residential activities. If any changes or redevelopment is proposed, the wording in the MRZ-P6 will come into play as the activity will be assessed as a non-complying activity. Considers that this approach at the policy level is unnecessarily restrictive towards upgrades, changes to, additions and alterations to existing lawfully established non-residential activities. Seeks that the policy be more explicit and relate to the establishment of new activities.	Amend MRZ-P6 as follows:  MRZ-P6: Non-residential activities  Limit <u>new</u> non-residential activities in the zone to:  a. prioritise efficient use of the zone for residential activities;  b. minimise effects on the vitality of centre zones, and  minimise effects on residential amenity.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /General	Shravan Miryala	217.64	Oppose	Considers that the “catch all other” Rule (Rule MRZ-R9 – Non-Complying) does not appropriately provide for any existing “other” activities. Considers that changes, alterations, additions, upgrades and replacement of existing non-residential activities, particularly service stations, should not be non-complying activities, considering the suite of objectives and policies for this zone (and other residential zones). Considers that the MRZ rules therefore do not adequately provide for existing service stations activities, including any additions or alterations to the existing activity and as a result, any addition or alteration to the existing activity is a non-complying activity in the zone under rule MRZ-R9 (activities not otherwise provided for). Considers that this is overly restrictive with respect to existing activities, and the continued operation and development on the same site. Seeks that a new discretionary activity rule for service stations, is included in the PDP in all residential zones Noting that the built development on the site will, irrespective, be controlled by the Standards.	Add new rule as follows:  <u>MRZ-RX: Alterations, additions and redevelopment of existing service stations</u>  <u>Activity status: Discretionary</u>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S7: Landscaped area	Shravan Miryala	217.65	Amend	Supports Standard MRZ-S7(3) requires at least 50% of the area of the front yard must comprise landscaped area as it relates to the development of new residential buildings. Any changes to existing service stations, for example, will have to consider this standard which is not currently achieved at the site identified above in the MRZ. Moreover, it is unlikely to be achievable for a number of functional requirement reasons, including traffic safety. Opposes the imposition of this standard to existing service stations sites. Acknowledges that landscaping along the road boundary can enhance the attractiveness of a site and mitigate the effects of the development of the site however for service station sites incorporating trees into front boundary landscaping is problematic. Considers that Council anticipates the planting of trees or plants that will be substantial enough to form a visual screen over time. Service station sites have a significant number of traffic movements into and out of the site per day and where visibility to the forecourt and to signage is critical to a successful and safe operation, substantial trees or hedging can create a nuisance commercially and in terms of root extent and traffic safety. Considers that trees, can block the view of signage and the forecourt, block visibility of vehicles entering and exiting, develop root systems that interfere with existing infrastructure and services and be difficult to achieve at service stations due to vehicle crossing requirements, tanker tracking and signage visibility.	Amend Standard MRZ-S7 to exclude existing service station sites from the landscaping requirements. This could be achieved by including the following additional exemption to the standard:  1. A residential unit at ground floor level must have a landscaped area of a minimum of 20% of a developed site with grass or plants, and can include the canopy of trees regardless of the ground treatment below them.  2. The landscaped area may be located on any part of the development site, and does not need to be associated with each residential unit.  3. At least 50% of the area of the front yard must comprise landscaped area.  <u>Except where:</u>  <u>a. the site is utilised by a lawfully established existing service station activity.</u>	Open Submission



# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /MRZ-R5: Relocated buildings	Sean Thompson	225.3	Amend	<p>Considers that it is not self-evident from the analysis and rationale in the proposed plan, including in terms of s 32 RMA, why relocated buildings should be classified as non-complying in the NCZ, LCZ, LFRZ, LIZ and GIZ. It is accepted that relocated buildings should be discretionary in the Natural Open Space Zone, and there may be urban design and other considerations applicable to the Town Centre Zone and City Centre Zone which warrant different treatment.</p> <p>Since a 2004 Central Otago Environment Court decision most local authorities in New Zealand have either adopted permitted activity classification for relocated buildings (with no standards) or provided for permitted activity status with prescribed performance standards.</p>	<p>Seeks to amend the relocated buildings activity PDP Rules as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Provide for relocated buildings as a permitted activity in all relevant zones (like MRZ), excepting where a specified heritage or conservation or urban design consideration applies;</li> <li>b. For the relocated building rules in all zones, the removal of the requirement to deposit a monitoring fee at the same time as submitting the relocated building report;</li> <li>c. Amending the performance standards in relation to relocated buildings in accordance with the wording in the attached Schedule 1 (which can be found in the attached submission), to provide for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. modification of the performance timeframes such that relocation on permanent foundation is required within two months, and twelve months is allowed for the completion of all reinstatement works;</li> <li>ii. provision for a pre-inspection report in the same or similar form as found in Schedule 2 (which can be found in the attached submission).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Consequential or further relief including to the relevant objectives, policies and provisions of the proposed plan in order to give effect to relief sought.</p> <p>(The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)</p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone / /	Jane Fordyce	226.1	Amend	Amend (MRZ) Medium Density Residential in particular to exclude Upham Crescent. Concerns of increased density increasing congestion. Does not find MRZ proposal fair due to loss of privacy, sunlight and neighbourhood character. Indicates other opportunities to develop different areas such as Parklands and Te Awa. Expresses unease about potential future developments of nearby reserves.	Seeks to delete Upham Crescent from proposed Medium Density Residential Zone.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential /	Bronwyn Alexander	227.1	Amend	Amend Medium Density Residential (MRZ) and High Density Residential (HRZ) to exclude McDonald Street and its surrounding area. Submitter wants to preserve character and architectural style of the neighbourhood. Feels MRZ and HRZ will further exacerbate parking issues. Has concerns about, privacy, sunlight, environmental impacts, and drainage capabilities in future flooding events.	Seeks to delete McDonald Street from the proposed MRZ and HRZ zones, the reasons are stated in detail in the full submission.	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Introduction	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.47	Amend	Considers Amending Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) introduction to allow for social infrastructure such as educational facilities. The Ministry does acknowledge that the purpose of the MRZ is to provide for residential activities. However, they still have an obligation to provide educational support and facilities for these communities.	<p>Seeks to make the following Amendments.</p> <p>The purpose of the Medium Density Residential Zone is to provide predominantly for residential activities with moderate concentration and bulk of buildings, such as detached, semi-detached, and terraced housing, low-rise apartments, and other compatible activities.</p> <p>Enabling medium-density development close to the city centres (and other amenities where appropriate) provides for a greater range of housing choice within Napier city. This supports increasing the capacity and choice of housing within neighbourhoods as well as promoting walkable neighbourhoods, fostering a sense of community, and increasing the vitality of centres.</p> <p>The Medium Density Residential Zone provisions provide for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Achieving quality residential environments, including optimised connectivity, safe and attractive streetscapes and parks that encourage walking, cycling, and recreation, sunlight access, privacy, and recognition of site context in design;</li> <li>· Enabling growth including intensification close to the city centre and amenities;</li> </ul>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.48	Support	Supports Development and activities that contribute to safe, secure communities that provide for social well-being. Considers the establishment of any educational facilities within Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) to contribute to social well-being.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P6: Non-residential activities	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.49	Amend	<p>Considers that educational facilities, particularly early childhood centres and schools, should be provided for where there is potential for a residential population to need educational support. If schools cannot locate in residential areas, traffic congestion can increase as parents have to drive their kids across town to school. Educational facilities are an essential form of social infrastructure required to meet the growing needs of the MRZ, and should therefore be enabled within the zone policies.</p> <p>To achieve the best planning practice, educational facilities should be represented in the objectives and policies as well as its own rule framework. Although the Ministry use the NoR process to designate school sites, in the Ministry's experience the objectives and policies of the relevant zone are important provisions which are used to assess NoR's.</p> <p>The Ministry request that an additional provision is included that enables non-residential activities (like educational facilities) if they support the community needs and wellbeing. This will allow the Ministry to provided schools for the community and better respond to growth over time.</p>	<p>Seeks to make the following amendment:</p> <p>MRZ-P6: Non-residential activities</p> <p>Limit non-residential activities in the zone to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>prioritise efficient use of the zone for residential activities;</li> <li>minimise effects on the vitality of centre zones, and</li> <li>minimise effects on residential amenity</li> <li>only those required to support well-functioning urban environments.</li> </ol>	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /General	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.50	Amend	<p>Considers rule MRZ-R9 acknowledges that activities which are not otherwise provided for are non-complying. Educational facilities are not provided for within the MRZ and are therefore a non-complying activity.</p> <p>Educational facilities are crucial social infrastructure required to support the surrounding residential catchments. Schools located in residential areas enable sustainable travel modes and walkable communities, as children can walk and cycle to school easily.</p> <p>Walkable communities reduce pressure on the road network and reduce carbon emissions.</p> <p>Therefore, the Ministry requests that educational facilities are enabled in the MRZ to serve the educational needs of the residential community as a restricted discretionary activity status. The Ministry proposes the following matters of discretion to restrict councils' assessment to the relevant effects.</p> <p>The matters of discretion we have proposed have been taken from other chapters in the Plan. However, if council does not support these, we would love the opportunity to work with council to refine these matters of discretion.</p>	<p>Seeks to Amend MRZ and add the following rule:</p> <p><u>MRZ-RX</u></p> <p><u>Educational Facility</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Scale, design and layout,</u></li> <li><u>Contribution to local community wellbeing;</u></li> <li><u>Neighbourhood character;</u></li> <li><u>Vibrancy and vitality of centres.</u></li> </ol>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential /	Samantha Judge	233.1	Oppose	<p>Would like to understand why proposed Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) are in areas that have risk of coastal inundation. Medium Density housing would remove all sunlight. There are no details about surrounding ground stabilisation, or recourse due to potential impacts on other properties. Has concerns about impacts on parking and transport.</p>	<p>Reject intensification of housing in coastal inundation areas. Significant risk to life.</p> <p>Reject apartment type dwellings in the area.</p> <p>Reject building proposals with less than one allocated off street parking space per unit dwelling.</p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential /General	Murray and Elly Buchanan	237.1	Oppose	<p>Opposes the introduction of medium and high density residential zones. Notes that with the change of government the Acts are being repealed while the NPS, if not also withdrawn, the inclusion of medium and high density zones to satisfy the requirements of the National Policy Statement is to be made voluntary for Councils to adopt.</p>	<p>Delete all the medium and high density residential provisions and replace with the existing residential zones.</p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /General	Angela Jones	240.17	Amend	<p>Considers it necessary for similar protections be provided to those in the Subdivision chapter (SUB-O3) insofar as it recognises the need for development to protect the operation and access to established and planned network utilities and regionally significant infrastructure.</p>	<p>Include a new objective:</p> <p><u>MRZ-Ox: Infrastructure provision</u></p> <p><u>Development protects the operation and access to established and planned network utilities and planned network utilities and regionally significant infrastructure while mitigating reverse sensitivity effects.</u></p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /General	Angela Jones	240.18	Amend	<p>Considers it necessary for similar protections be provided to those in the Subdivision chapter (SUB-P9) insofar as it recognises the need for development to protect the operation and access to established and planned network utilities and regionally significant infrastructure.</p>	<p>Include a new policy:</p> <p><u>MRZ-Px: Integrated provision of infrastructure</u></p> <p><u>Require development to provide servicing that is coordinated, integrated, and compatible with the existing and planned infrastructure network.</u></p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential /General	Teela Nilkins	241.1	Oppose	<p>Opposes Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) in their street (close to William Colenso College), as submitters street is very busy due to being adjacent to a school, which means it is congested. Doesn't think it is fair to have 3 storey buildings on a quiet street. There is limited parking and the noise from MRZ with stereos and party's would cause concern.</p>	<p>Relief Sought is not included, however it is inferred that the submitter seeks the Medium Density Residential Zone to not be applied to their street.</p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Maryanne Macintosh	243.1	Oppose	<p>Has concerns that 3 storey dwellings will impact privacy, sunlight, and loss of neighbourhood character.</p>	<p>Relief Sought is not included, though it is inferred that the submitter wishes to reduce the maximum building height in the MRZ.</p>	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S9: Garages and accessory buildings	Maryanne Macintosh	243.2	Oppose	Objects MRZ-S9. Hopes developments would include a garage, as there are already congestion issues in regard to King Street.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O3: Quality living environments	Maryanne Macintosh	243.4	Oppose	Many Schools within MRZ are already up to capacity, submitter states children need space.Has concerns of Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) impacting quality of life. Living in an attractive environment with greenspace is important to people's well-being.Infrastructure is another concern, with reference to stormwater during the cyclone. Notes, Singapore's requirements for greenspaces, flooding of streets, grass is needed for water drainage, and a geyser in Elbourne Street.Considers safety of elderly important, with reference to break ins. Submitter states MRZ and HRZ makes it harder to know neighbours, creating a loss of connection.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	John Prucher	244.1	Amend	Amend Medium Density Residential (MRZ) and High Density Residential (HRZ) housing zones to exclude Taradale.Submitter states personal freedoms are diminished through such housing zones and social cohesion is not existent impacting health of residents. Lack of outdoor space is detrimental especially to those with children. Taradale as it is, has character and social cohesion, MRZ and HRZ will destroy this.	Seeks to delete MRZ and HRZ from the plan. Seeks to amend that plan to include more retirement villages.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /General	Phil Stickney	247.19	Amend	Amend to improve useability and clarity changes sought to the Objectives framework contained within MRZ-01 to MRZ 05.	Amend to focus on salient matters.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P4: Quality living environments - within the site	Phil Stickney	247.20	Amend	Considers changes to Policy MRZ-P4 to encourage and enable more creative design in respect of open space areas their options for configuration. This better reflects the degree of flexibility that is inherently required to achieve the outcomes sought by MRZ-01 and MRZ-02.	Amend MRZ-P4 to enable a greater degree of flexibility in the provision of open space areas.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P4: Quality living environments - within the site	Phil Stickney	247.21	Amend	Considers that MRZ-P4 should be amended to reflect that parking on site is no longer required by virtue of the NPS-UD 2020 for a Tier 2 Urban Area (of which Napier is one such area). The amendment sought seeks to clarify that this Policy is of relevance where off-street parking is provided, while recognising that accessible parking remains a mandatory requirement.	Amend to reflect the requirements of the NPS-UD 2020 more clearly.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P7: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Phil Stickney	247.22	Amend	Considers an amendment necessary to MRZ-P7 are sought that better reflect the definition of effects as set out in s.3 of the RMA (meaning of effect)	Amend MRZ-P7 to relate to the definition in s.3 of the RMA	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /MRZ-R3: Home business	Phil Stickney	247.23	Oppose	Opposes Rule MRZ-R3 (4)(b) as there appears to be no substantive rationale to the inclusion of this provision within the context of an urban zone enabling medium density housing typologies relative to home businesses.	Delete this provision.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S4: Other yards	Phil Stickney	247.25	Amend	Considers an amendment necessary to MRZ-S4 to make it clear that the intent of the rule only applies to existing boundaries (i.e., the "parent title") of a development site and not to any new boundary created by a subdivision as part of a medium density development.	Amend the rule to reference that internal new boundaries created as part of the terrace or multi-unit development are excluded.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S11: Outdoor living space	Phil Stickney	247.26	Oppose	Considers amendments to Rule MRZ-S11 are required as there appear to be editing errors in the standards relating to ground floor outdoor living space requirements. The standards in MRZ-S11 include requirements for roof terraces, balconies which are captured by the ground floor residential unit requirements. MRZ-S11 (3 and 4) are unduly restrictive in the context of seeking to achieve a compact urban form and will restrict the potential development of sites in an efficient manner.	Amend to clarify ground floor standards and delete MRZ-S11(3 and 4).	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S11: Outdoor living space	Phil Stickney	247.27	Oppose	Considers an amendment to include graphics or an explanatory statement would assist in useability and understanding. Amend MRZ-S11 to avoid a conflict with MRZ-S12. By achieving the outdoor living space standards contained within Rule MRZ-S11, that does not seemingly readily enable a denser form of development given the minimum dimensions imposed on the Outlook Space rules in MRZ-S12.	Amend the rule to achieve better alignment with yards and outdoor space requirements.	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S12: Residential outlook space	Phil Stickney	247.28	Oppose	<p>Considers amendments to this standard should include graphics or an explanatory statement would assist in useability and understanding. Perceived conflict with MRZ-S11. By achieving the outdoor living space standards contained within Rule MRZ-S11, that does not seemingly readily enable a denser form of development given the minimum dimensions imposed on the Outlook Space rules in MRZ-S12.</p> <p>Considers amendments are necessary to MRZ-S12 to ensure that every habitable room has an outlook control but that there is the ability to provide flexibility in design outcomes depending on the design.</p>	Amend the rule to achieve better alignment with yards and outdoor space requirements.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S14: Maximum building length	Phil Stickney	247.29	Oppose	Opposes the controls in MRZ-S14 relating to maximum building length as these do not enable flexibility in responding to site characteristics and enable efficient use of the land resource in all instances. The standard is considered unduly restrictive.	Delete this rule.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Assessment criteria /General	Phil Stickney	247.30	Amend	Supports the provisions set out in MRZ-AC1 to MRZ-AC 5 subject to minor amendments, the intent of which is to clarify some aspects of the currently proposed rule drafting and terminology.	Amend provisions to aid in clarity and focus on salient matters clearly.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Assessment criteria /MRZ-AC1: Residential units (MRZ-R1); Relocated buildings (MRZ-R5); Retirement village premises (MRZ-R6)	Phil Stickney	247.31	Amend	Considers the renumbering of MRZ-AC1 as (a). only directs the user to the provisions of (b). in the corresponding provisions below. The use of numerical sub-headings is also suggested for user readability (as per the balance of the provisions).	Delete (a) and reformat.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S11: Outdoor living space	Catherine Haslam	255.1	Amend	Amend (MRZ) Medium Density Residential Zone in Vigor Brown Street. Believes it will not benefit neighbourhoods proposed and won't fit into the aesthetic of heritage homes in Vigor Brown Street. Also presents concerns of loss of privacy and sunlight.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S11: Outdoor living space	Catherine Haslam	255.2	Amend	Amend (MRZ) Medium Density Residential Zone in Vigor Brown Street. Believes it will not benefit neighbourhoods proposed and won't fit into the aesthetic of heritage homes in Vigor Brown Street. Also presents concerns of loss of privacy and sunlight.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S13: Minimum residential unit size	Catherine Haslam	255.3	Amend	Amend (MRZ) Medium Density Residential Zone in Vigor Brown Street. Believes it will not benefit neighbourhoods proposed and won't fit into the aesthetic of heritage homes Vigor Brown Street. Also presents concerns of loss of privacy and sunlight.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Rachel Hammond	256.1	Amend	Amend Medium Density Residential (MRZ) to exclude Vigor Brown Street. Has not been aware of proposal. MRZ will compromise the streets heritage and ruin its aesthetic. MRZ would be suitable for other areas but not for Vigor Brown Street. Concerns of MRZ impacting Sunlight, Privacy, Parking, and value of homes, making the area less desirable.	Seeks to delete Vigor Brown Street from proposed MRZ and keep the street as one of Napier's character streets. MRZ is better suited to areas that don't have special character.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Rachel Hammond	256.2	Amend	Amend Medium Density Residential (MRZ) to exclude Vigor Brown Street. Has not been aware of proposal. MRZ will compromise the streets heritage and ruin its aesthetic. MRZ would be suitable for other areas but not for Vigor Brown Street. Concerns of MRZ impacting Sunlight, Privacy, Parking, and value of homes, making the area less desirable.	Seeks to delete Vigor Brown Street from proposed MRZ and keep the street as one of Napier's character streets. MRZ is better suited to areas that don't have special character.	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Judith Mary Robinson	260.1	Amend	<p>Amend Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) as they include Peddie Street, King Street and Elbourne Street. Specifically opposes listed provisions, MRZ-O2, MRZ-O3, MRZ-O4, MRZ-O5, MRZ-P6, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P4, MRZ-P7, MRZ-S1, MRZ-S2, MRZ-S6, MRZ-S7, MRZ-S12, MRZ-S8. Submitter doesn't want height restrictions to apply to their section and surrounds. And would like to see such provisions amended, particularly regarding sunlight, street access and water drainage. MRZ shouldn't impact noise levels.</p> <p>The plan does not consider the wellbeing of existing residents. Submitters concerns are, sunlight deprivation, water/stormwater drainage, privacy, ensuring greenspace, considering needs of ageing residents, and traffic. Suggests to only build on the northside of Elbourne/Peddie Street and to start apartment development of Taradale shopping centre. New fences and surfaces should be heat absorbing. Buildings should be staggered to get sun. Lower percentage of impervious surfaces and the Ngaruroro stop bank will need raising. Suggests fewer concrete drives with wood surfaces under limestone.</p> <p>What is "one residential unit" (e.g. in MRZ-R1) please?</p> <p>What is the distance that constitutes a 'neighbour' please?</p>	<p>Seeks to have further consultation on the locations that are suitable for development.</p> <p>Seeks to have an opportunity to expand their ideas.</p> <p>Seeks further development of water drainage/stormwater drainage.</p> <p>Seeks to ensure developments take measures to mitigate climate change.</p> <p>Seeks to have sunlight corridors.</p> <p>Seeks to amend permitted heights.</p> <p>Seeks to have noise issues addressed.</p> <p>The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission.</p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O3: Quality living environments	Judith Mary Robinson	260.2	Amend	<p>Amend Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) as they include Peddie Street, King Street and Elbourne Street. Specifically opposes listed provisions, MRZ-O2, MRZ-O3, MRZ-O4, MRZ-O5, MRZ-P6, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P4, MRZ-P7, MRZ-S1, MRZ-S2, MRZ-S6, MRZ-S7, MRZ-S12, MRZ-S8. Submitter doesn't want height restrictions to apply to their section and surrounds. And would like to see such provisions amended, particularly regarding sunlight, street access and water drainage. MRZ shouldn't impact noise levels.</p> <p>The plan does not consider the wellbeing of existing residents. Submitters concerns are, sunlight deprivation, water/stormwater drainage, privacy, ensuring greenspace, considering needs of ageing residents, and traffic. Suggests to only build on the northside of Elbourne/Peddie Street and to start apartment development of Taradale shopping centre. New fences and surfaces should be heat absorbing. Buildings should be staggered to get sun. Lower percentage of impervious surfaces and the Ngaruroro stop bank will need raising. Suggests fewer concrete drives with wood surfaces under limestone.</p> <p>What is "one residential unit" (e.g. in MRZ-R1) please?</p> <p>What is the distance that constitutes a 'neighbour' please?</p>	<p>Seeks to have further consultation on the locations that are suitable for development.</p> <p>Seeks to have an opportunity to expand their ideas.</p> <p>Seeks further development of water drainage/stormwater drainage.</p> <p>Seeks to ensure developments take measures to mitigate climate change.</p> <p>Seeks to have sunlight corridors.</p> <p>Seeks to amend permitted heights.</p> <p>Seeks to have noise issues addressed.</p> <p>The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission.</p>	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-04: Neighbourhood character and identity	Judith Mary Robinson	260.3	Amend	<p>Amend Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) as they include Peddie Street, King Street and Elbourne Street. Specifically opposes listed provisions, MRZ-O2, MRZ-O3, MRZ-O4, MRZ-O5, MRZ-P6, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P4, MRZ-P7, MRZ-S1, MRZ-S2, MRZ-S6, MRZ-S7, MRZ-S12, MRZ-S8. Submitter doesn't want height restrictions to apply to their section and surrounds. And would like to see such provisions amended, particularly regarding sunlight, street access and water drainage. MRZ shouldn't impact noise levels.</p> <p>The plan does not consider the wellbeing of existing residents. Submitters concerns are, sunlight deprivation, water/stormwater drainage, privacy, ensuring greenspace, considering needs of ageing residents, and traffic. Suggests to only build on the northside of Elbourne/Peddie Street and to start apartment development of Taradale shopping centre. New fences and surfaces should be heat absorbing. Buildings should be staggered to get sun. Lower percentage of impervious surfaces and the Ngaruroro stop bank will need raising. Suggests fewer concrete drives with wood surfaces under limestone.</p> <p>What is "one residential unit" (e.g. in MRZ-R1) please?</p> <p>What is the distance that constitutes a 'neighbour' please?</p>	<p>Seeks to have further consultation on the locations that are suitable for development.</p> <p>Seeks to have an opportunity to expand their ideas.</p> <p>Seeks further development of water drainage/stormwater drainage.</p> <p>Seeks to ensure developments take measures to mitigate climate change.</p> <p>Seeks to have sunlight corridors.</p> <p>Seeks to amend permitted heights.</p> <p>Seeks to have noise issues addressed.</p> <p>The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission.</p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-05: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Judith Mary Robinson	260.4	Amend	<p>Amend Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) as they include Peddie Street, King Street and Elbourne Street. Specifically opposes listed provisions, MRZ-O2, MRZ-O3, MRZ-O4, MRZ-O5, MRZ-P6, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P4, MRZ-P7, MRZ-S1, MRZ-S2, MRZ-S6, MRZ-S7, MRZ-S12, MRZ-S8. Submitter doesn't want height restrictions to apply to their section and surrounds. And would like to see such provisions amended, particularly regarding sunlight, street access and water drainage. MRZ shouldn't impact noise levels.</p> <p>The plan does not consider the wellbeing of existing residents. Submitters concerns are, sunlight deprivation, water/stormwater drainage, privacy, ensuring greenspace, considering needs of ageing residents, and traffic. Suggests to only build on the northside of Elbourne/Peddie Street and to start apartment development of Taradale shopping centre. New fences and surfaces should be heat absorbing. Buildings should be staggered to get sun. Lower percentage of impervious surfaces and the Ngaruroro stop bank will need raising. Suggests fewer concrete drives with wood surfaces under limestone.</p> <p>What is "one residential unit" (e.g. in MRZ-R1) please?</p> <p>What is the distance that constitutes a 'neighbour' please?</p>	<p>Seeks to have further consultation on the locations that are suitable for development.</p> <p>Seeks to have an opportunity to expand their ideas.</p> <p>Seeks further development of water drainage/stormwater drainage.</p> <p>Seeks to ensure developments take measures to mitigate climate change.</p> <p>Seeks to have sunlight corridors.</p> <p>Seeks to amend permitted heights.</p> <p>Seeks to have noise issues addressed.</p> <p>The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission</p>	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P6: Non-residential activities	Judith Mary Robinson	260.5	Amend	<p>Amend Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) as they include Peddie Street, King Street and Elbourne Street. Specifically opposes listed provisions, MRZ-O2, MRZ-O3, MRZ-O4, MRZ-O5, MRZ-P6, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P4, MRZ-P7, MRZ-S1, MRZ-S2, MRZ-S6, MRZ-S7, MRZ-S12, MRZ-S8. Submitter doesn't want height restrictions to apply to their section and surrounds. And would like to see such provisions amended, particularly regarding sunlight, street access and water drainage. MRZ shouldn't impact noise levels.</p> <p>The plan does not consider the wellbeing of existing residents. Submitters concerns are, sunlight deprivation, water/stormwater drainage, privacy, ensuring greenspace, considering needs of ageing residents, and traffic. Suggests to only build on the northside of Elbourne/Peddie Street and to start apartment development of Taradale shopping centre. New fences and surfaces should be heat absorbing. Buildings should be staggered to get sun. Lower percentage of impervious surfaces and the Ngaruroro stop bank will need raising. Suggests fewer concrete drives with wood surfaces under limestone.</p> <p>What is "one residential unit" (e.g. in MRZ-R1) please?</p> <p>What is the distance that constitutes a 'neighbour' please?</p>	<p>Seeks to have further consultation on the locations that are suitable for development.</p> <p>Seeks to have an opportunity to expand their ideas.</p> <p>Seeks further development of water drainage/stormwater drainage.</p> <p>Seeks to ensure developments take measures to mitigate climate change.</p> <p>Seeks to have sunlight corridors.</p> <p>Seeks to amend permitted heights.</p> <p>Seeks to have noise issues addressed.</p> <p>The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission</p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P3: Quality living environments - adjoining sites	Judith Mary Robinson	260.6	Amend	<p>Amend Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) as they include Peddie Street, King Street and Elbourne Street. Specifically opposes listed provisions, MRZ-O2, MRZ-O3, MRZ-O4, MRZ-O5, MRZ-P6, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P4, MRZ-P7, MRZ-S1, MRZ-S2, MRZ-S6, MRZ-S7, MRZ-S12, MRZ-S8. Submitter doesn't want height restrictions to apply to their section and surrounds. And would like to see such provisions amended, particularly regarding sunlight, street access and water drainage. MRZ shouldn't impact noise levels.</p> <p>The plan does not consider the wellbeing of existing residents. Submitters concerns are, sunlight deprivation, water/stormwater drainage, privacy, ensuring greenspace, considering needs of ageing residents, and traffic. Suggests to only build on the northside of Elbourne/Peddie Street and to start apartment development of Taradale shopping centre. New fences and surfaces should be heat absorbing. Buildings should be staggered to get sun. Lower percentage of impervious surfaces and the Ngaruroro stop bank will need raising. Suggests fewer concrete drives with wood surfaces under limestone.</p> <p>What is "one residential unit" (e.g. in MRZ-R1) please?</p> <p>What is the distance that constitutes a 'neighbour' please?</p>	<p>Seeks to have further consultation on the locations that are suitable for development.</p> <p>Seeks to have an opportunity to expand their ideas.</p> <p>Seeks further development of water drainage/stormwater drainage.</p> <p>Seeks to ensure developments take measures to mitigate climate change.</p> <p>Seeks to have sunlight corridors.</p> <p>Seeks to amend permitted heights.</p> <p>Seeks to have noise issues addressed.</p> <p>The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission.</p>	Open Submission



# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P4: Quality living environments - within the site	Judith Mary Robinson	260.7	Amend	<p>Amend Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) as they include Peddie Street, King Street and Elbourne Street. Specifically opposes listed provisions, MRZ-O2, MRZ-O3, MRZ-O4, MRZ-O5, MRZ-P6, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P4, MRZ-P7, MRZ-S1, MRZ-S2, MRZ-S6, MRZ-S7, MRZ-S12, MRZ-S8. Submitter doesn't want height restrictions to apply to their section and surrounds. And would like to see such provisions amended, particularly regarding sunlight, street access and water drainage. MRZ shouldn't impact noise levels.</p> <p>The plan does not consider the wellbeing of existing residents. Submitters concerns are, sunlight deprivation, water/stormwater drainage, privacy, ensuring greenspace, considering needs of ageing residents, and traffic. Suggests to only build on the northside of Elbourne/Peddie Street and to start apartment development of Taradale shopping centre. New fences and surfaces should be heat absorbing. Buildings should be staggered to get sun. Lower percentage of impervious surfaces and the Ngaruroro stop bank will need raising. Suggests fewer concrete drives with wood surfaces under limestone.</p> <p>What is "one residential unit" (e.g. in MRZ-R1) please?</p> <p>What is the distance that constitutes a 'neighbour' please?</p>	<p>Seeks to have further consultation on the locations that are suitable for development.</p> <p>Seeks to have an opportunity to expand their ideas.</p> <p>Seeks further development of water drainage/stormwater drainage.</p> <p>Seeks to ensure developments take measures to mitigate climate change.</p> <p>Seeks to have sunlight corridors.</p> <p>Seeks to amend permitted heights.</p> <p>Seeks to have noise issues addressed.</p> <p>The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission.</p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P7: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Judith Mary Robinson	260.8	Amend	<p>Amend Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) as they include Peddie Street, King Street and Elbourne Street. Specifically opposes listed provisions, MRZ-O2, MRZ-O3, MRZ-O4, MRZ-O5, MRZ-P6, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P4, MRZ-P7, MRZ-S1, MRZ-S2, MRZ-S6, MRZ-S7, MRZ-S12, MRZ-S8. Submitter doesn't want height restrictions to apply to their section and surrounds. And would like to see such provisions amended, particularly regarding sunlight, street access and water drainage. MRZ shouldn't impact noise levels.</p> <p>The plan does not consider the wellbeing of existing residents. Submitters concerns are, sunlight deprivation, water/stormwater drainage, privacy, ensuring greenspace, considering needs of ageing residents, and traffic. Suggests to only build on the northside of Elbourne/Peddie Street and to start apartment development of Taradale shopping centre. New fences and surfaces should be heat absorbing. Buildings should be staggered to get sun. Lower percentage of impervious surfaces and the Ngaruroro stop bank will need raising. Suggests fewer concrete drives with wood surfaces under limestone.</p> <p>What is "one residential unit" (e.g. in MRZ-R1) please?</p> <p>What is the distance that constitutes a 'neighbour' please?</p>	<p>Seeks to have further consultation on the locations that are suitable for development.</p> <p>Seeks to have an opportunity to expand their ideas.</p> <p>Seeks further development of water drainage/stormwater drainage.</p> <p>Seeks to ensure developments take measures to mitigate climate change.</p> <p>Seeks to have sunlight corridors.</p> <p>Seeks to amend permitted heights.</p> <p>Seeks to have noise issues addressed.</p> <p>The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission.</p>	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Judith Mary Robinson	260.9	Amend	<p>Amend Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) as they include Peddie Street, King Street and Elbourne Street. Specifically opposes listed provisions, MRZ-O2, MRZ-O3, MRZ-O4, MRZ-O5, MRZ-P6, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P4, MRZ-P7, MRZ-S1, MRZ-S2, MRZ-S6, MRZ-S7, MRZ-S12, MRZ-S8. Submitter doesn't want height restrictions to apply to their section and surrounds. And would like to see such provisions amended, particularly regarding sunlight, street access and water drainage. MRZ shouldn't impact noise levels.</p> <p>The plan does not consider the wellbeing of existing residents. Submitters concerns are, sunlight deprivation, water/stormwater drainage, privacy, ensuring greenspace, considering needs of ageing residents, and traffic. Suggests to only build on the northside of Elbourne/Peddie Street and to start apartment development of Taradale shopping centre. New fences and surfaces should be heat absorbing. Buildings should be staggered to get sun. Lower percentage of impervious surfaces and the Ngaruroro stop bank will need raising. Suggests fewer concrete drives with wood surfaces under limestone.</p> <p>What is "one residential unit" (e.g. in MRZ-R1) please?</p> <p>What is the distance that constitutes a 'neighbour' please?</p>	<p>Seeks to have further consultation on the locations that are suitable for development.</p> <p>Seeks to have an opportunity to expand their ideas.</p> <p>Seeks further development of water drainage/stormwater drainage.</p> <p>Seeks to ensure developments take measures to mitigate climate change.</p> <p>Seeks to have sunlight corridors.</p> <p>Seeks to amend permitted heights.</p> <p>Seeks to have noise issues addressed.</p> <p>The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission.</p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary	Judith Mary Robinson	260.10	Amend	<p>Amend Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) as they include Peddie Street, King Street and Elbourne Street. Specifically opposes listed provisions, MRZ-O2, MRZ-O3, MRZ-O4, MRZ-O5, MRZ-P6, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P4, MRZ-P7, MRZ-S1, MRZ-S2, MRZ-S6, MRZ-S7, MRZ-S12, MRZ-S8. Submitter doesn't want height restrictions to apply to their section and surrounds. And would like to see such provisions amended, particularly regarding sunlight, street access and water drainage. MRZ shouldn't impact noise levels.</p> <p>The plan does not consider the wellbeing of existing residents. Submitters concerns are, sunlight deprivation, water/stormwater drainage, privacy, ensuring greenspace, considering needs of ageing residents, and traffic. Suggests to only build on the northside of Elbourne/Peddie Street and to start apartment development of Taradale shopping centre. New fences and surfaces should be heat absorbing. Buildings should be staggered to get sun. Lower percentage of impervious surfaces and the Ngaruroro stop bank will need raising. Suggests fewer concrete drives with wood surfaces under limestone.</p> <p>What is "one residential unit" (e.g. in MRZ-R1) please?</p> <p>What is the distance that constitutes a 'neighbour' please?</p>	<p>Seeks to have further consultation on the locations that are suitable for development.</p> <p>Seeks to have an opportunity to expand their ideas.</p> <p>Seeks further development of water drainage/stormwater drainage.</p> <p>Seeks to ensure developments take measures to mitigate climate change.</p> <p>Seeks to have sunlight corridors.</p> <p>Seeks to amend permitted heights.</p> <p>Seeks to have noise issues addressed.</p> <p>The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission.</p>	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S6: Impervious area	Judith Mary Robinson	260.11	Amend	<p>Amend Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) as they include Peddie Street, King Street and Elbourne Street. Specifically opposes listed provisions, MRZ-O2, MRZ-O3, MRZ-O4, MRZ-O5, MRZ-P6, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P4, MRZ-P7, MRZ-S1, MRZ-S2, MRZ-S6, MRZ-S7, MRZ-S12, MRZ-S8. Submitter doesn't want height restrictions to apply to their section and surrounds. And would like to see such provisions amended, particularly regarding sunlight, street access and water drainage. MRZ shouldn't impact noise levels.</p> <p>The plan does not consider the wellbeing of existing residents. Submitters concerns are, sunlight deprivation, water/stormwater drainage, privacy, ensuring greenspace, considering needs of ageing residents, and traffic. Suggests to only build on the northside of Elbourne/Peddie Street and to start apartment development of Taradale shopping centre. New fences and surfaces should be heat absorbing. Buildings should be staggered to get sun. Lower percentage of impervious surfaces and the Ngaruroro stop bank will need raising. Suggests fewer concrete drives with wood surfaces under limestone.</p> <p>What is "one residential unit" (e.g. in MRZ-R1) please?</p> <p>What is the distance that constitutes a 'neighbour' please?</p>	<p>Seeks to have further consultation on the locations that are suitable for development.</p> <p>Seeks to have an opportunity to expand their ideas.</p> <p>Seeks further development of water drainage/stormwater drainage.</p> <p>Seeks to ensure developments take measures to mitigate climate change.</p> <p>Seeks to have sunlight corridors.</p> <p>Seeks to amend permitted heights.</p> <p>Seeks to have noise issues addressed.</p> <p>The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission.</p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S7: Landscaped area	Judith Mary Robinson	260.12	Amend	<p>Amend Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) as they include Peddie Street, King Street and Elbourne Street. Specifically opposes listed provisions, MRZ-O2, MRZ-O3, MRZ-O4, MRZ-O5, MRZ-P6, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P4, MRZ-P7, MRZ-S1, MRZ-S2, MRZ-S6, MRZ-S7, MRZ-S12, MRZ-S8. Submitter doesn't want height restrictions to apply to their section and surrounds. And would like to see such provisions amended, particularly regarding sunlight, street access and water drainage. MRZ shouldn't impact noise levels.</p> <p>The plan does not consider the wellbeing of existing residents. Submitters concerns are, sunlight deprivation, water/stormwater drainage, privacy, ensuring greenspace, considering needs of ageing residents, and traffic. Suggests to only build on the northside of Elbourne/Peddie Street and to start apartment development of Taradale shopping centre. New fences and surfaces should be heat absorbing. Buildings should be staggered to get sun. Lower percentage of impervious surfaces and the Ngaruroro stop bank will need raising. Suggests fewer concrete drives with wood surfaces under limestone.</p> <p>What is "one residential unit" (e.g. in MRZ-R1) please?</p> <p>What is the distance that constitutes a 'neighbour' please?</p>	<p>Seeks to have further consultation on the locations that are suitable for development.</p> <p>Seeks to have an opportunity to expand their ideas.</p> <p>Seeks further development of water drainage/stormwater drainage.</p> <p>Seeks to ensure developments take measures to mitigate climate change.</p> <p>Seeks to have sunlight corridors.</p> <p>Seeks to amend permitted heights.</p> <p>Seeks to have noise issues addressed.</p> <p>The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission.</p>	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S12: Residential outlook space	Judith Mary Robinson	260.13	Amend	<p>Amend Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) as they include Peddie Street, King Street and Elbourne Street. Specifically opposes listed provisions, MRZ-O2, MRZ-O3, MRZ-O4, MRZ-O5, MRZ-P6, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P4, MRZ-P7, MRZ-S1, MRZ-S2, MRZ-S6, MRZ-S7, MRZ-S12, MRZ-S8. Submitter doesn't want height restrictions to apply to their section and surrounds. And would like to see such provisions amended, particularly regarding sunlight, street access and water drainage. MRZ shouldn't impact noise levels.</p> <p>The plan does not consider the wellbeing of existing residents. Submitters concerns are, sunlight deprivation, water/stormwater drainage, privacy, ensuring greenspace, considering needs of ageing residents, and traffic. Suggests to only build on the northside of Elbourne/Peddie Street and to start apartment development of Taradale shopping centre. New fences and surfaces should be heat absorbing. Buildings should be staggered to get sun. Lower percentage of impervious surfaces and the Ngaruroro stop bank will need raising. Suggests fewer concrete drives with wood surfaces under limestone.</p> <p>What is "one residential unit" (e.g. in MRZ-R1) please?</p> <p>What is the distance that constitutes a 'neighbour' please?</p>	<p>Seeks to have further consultation on the locations that are suitable for development.</p> <p>Seeks to have an opportunity to expand their ideas.</p> <p>Seeks further development of water drainage/stormwater drainage.</p> <p>Seeks to ensure developments take measures to mitigate climate change.</p> <p>Seeks to have sunlight corridors.</p> <p>Seeks to amend permitted heights.</p> <p>Seeks to have noise issues addressed.</p> <p>The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission.</p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S8: Fences and walls	Judith Mary Robinson	260.14	Amend	<p>Amend Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) as they include Peddie Street, King Street and Elbourne Street. Specifically opposes listed provisions, MRZ-O2, MRZ-O3, MRZ-O4, MRZ-O5, MRZ-P6, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P4, MRZ-P7, MRZ-S1, MRZ-S2, MRZ-S6, MRZ-S7, MRZ-S12, MRZ-S8. Submitter doesn't want height restrictions to apply to their section and surrounds. And would like to see such provisions amended, particularly regarding sunlight, street access and water drainage. MRZ shouldn't impact noise levels.</p> <p>The plan does not consider the wellbeing of existing residents. Submitters concerns are, sunlight deprivation, water/stormwater drainage, privacy, ensuring greenspace, considering needs of ageing residents, and traffic. Suggests to only build on the northside of Elbourne/Peddie Street and to start apartment development of Taradale shopping centre. New fences and surfaces should be heat absorbing. Buildings should be staggered to get sun. Lower percentage of impervious surfaces and the Ngaruroro stop bank will need raising. Suggests fewer concrete drives with wood surfaces under limestone.</p> <p>What is "one residential unit" (e.g. in MRZ-R1) please?</p> <p>What is the distance that constitutes a 'neighbour' please?</p>	<p>Seeks to have further consultation on the locations that are suitable for development.</p> <p>Seeks to have an opportunity to expand their ideas.</p> <p>Seeks further development of water drainage/stormwater drainage.</p> <p>Seeks to ensure developments take measures to mitigate climate change.</p> <p>Seeks to have sunlight corridors.</p> <p>Seeks to amend permitted heights.</p> <p>Seeks to have noise issues addressed.</p> <p>The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission.</p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /General	Phil Stickney	263.20	Amend	Amend MRZ-O1 to MRZ-O5 to improve useability and clarity.	Redraft to focus on salient matters.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P4: Quality living environments - within the site	Phil Stickney	263.21	Amend	<p>Amend Policy MRZ-P4 to encourage and enable more creative design in respect of open space areas their options for configuration. This better reflects the degree of flexibility that is inherently required to achieve the outcomes sought by MRZ-O1 and MRZ-O2.</p> <p>Clarify the fact in MRZ-P4 that parking on site is no longer required by virtue of the NPS-UD 2020 for a Tier 2 Urban Area (of which Napier is one such area). The amendment sought seeks to clarify that this Policy is of relevance where off-street parking is provided, while recognising that accessible parking remains a mandatory requirement.</p>	<p>Amend MRZ-P4 to enable a greater degree of flexibility in the provision of open space areas.</p> <p>Amend to reflect the requirements of the NPS-UD 2020 more clearly.</p>	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P7: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Phil Stickney	263.22	Amend	Amendments to MRZ-P7 are sought that better reflect the definition of effects as set out in s.3 of The Act.	Amend MRZ-P7 to relate to the definition in s.3 of The Act.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /MRZ-R3: Home business	Phil Stickney	263.23	Oppose	Amend Rule MRZ-R3 (4)(b) as there appears to be no substantive rationale to the inclusion of this provision within the context of an urban zone enabling medium density housing typologies relative to home businesses.	Delete this provision.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S4: Other yards	Phil Stickney	263.24	Amend	Amend MRZ-S4 to make it clear that the intent of the rule only applies to existing boundaries (i.e., the "parent title") of a development site and not to any new boundary created by a subdivision as part of a medium density development.	Amend the rule to reference that internal new boundaries created as part of the terrace or multi-unit development are excluded.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S11: Outdoor living space	Phil Stickney	263.25	Oppose	<p>1. Amend Rule MRZ-S11, as there appear to be editing errors in the standards relating to ground floor outdoor living space requirements. The standards in MRZ-S11 include requirements for roof terraces, balconies which are captured by the ground floor residential unit requirements. MRZ-S11 (3 and 4) are unduly restrictive in the context of seeking to achieve a compact urban form and will restrict the potential development of sites in an efficient manner.</p> <p>2. MRZS-11(3) is also unclear in intent and structure. The inclusion of enhanced graphics or an explanatory statement would assist in usability and understanding. Changes are sought to MRZ-S12 with seeming conflict with MRZ-S11. By achieving the outdoor living space standards contained within Rule MRZ-S11, that does not seemingly readily enable a denser form of development given the minimum dimensions imposed on the Outlook Space rules in MRZ-S12. Amendments are also sought to MRZ-S12 to ensure that every habitable room has an outlook control but that there is the ability to provide flexibility in design outcomes depending on the design.</p>	<p>1. Seeks to Amend to clarify ground floor standards and delete MRZ-S11(3 and 4).</p> <p>2. Seeks to Amend the rule to achieve better alignment with yards and outdoor space requirements.</p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S13: Minimum residential unit size	Phil Stickney	263.26	Amend	Amend the minimum floor areas for units in Rule MRZ-S13, as with good design it is possible to provide an appropriate living environment that varies from the standards set out.	Amend MRZ-S13 to include: <a href="#">a) Studio: 35sqm</a> <a href="#">b) 1 bed: 45 sqm</a> <a href="#">c) 2-bed: 60sqm</a> <a href="#">d) 3-bed: 80sqm</a>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S14: Maximum building length	Phil Stickney	263.27	Oppose	Opposes the controls in MRZ-S14 relating to maximum building length as these do not enable flexibility in responding to site characteristics and enable efficient use of the land resource in all instances. The standard is considered unduly restrictive.	Delete this rule.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Assessment criteria /General	Phil Stickney	263.28	Amend	Generally support the provisions set out in MRZ-AC1 to MRZ-AC 5 subject to minor amendments, the intent of which is to clarify some aspects of the currently proposed rule drafting and terminology.	Amend provisions to aid in clarity and focus on salient matters clearly.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Assessment criteria /MRZ-AC1: Residential units (MRZ-R1); Relocated buildings (MRZ-R5); Retirement village premises (MRZ-R6)	Phil Stickney	263.29	Amend	Seeks the renumbering of MRZ-AC1 as (a). only directs the user to the provisions of (b). in the corresponding provisions below. The use of numerical sub-headings is also suggested for user readability (as per the balance of the provisions).	Delete (a) and reformat.	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Vivienne Fraser	265.2	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan and high and medium density zones. Notes that growth is estimated at 0.6 - 0.8%. Considers that all of the proposals need to be halted or drastically amended to retain the basic rights and needs of every person, and that the plan removes basic and core rights. Considers that there is a lack of supportive infrastructure for increased population density. Considers there is a greater risk of flooding due to larger catchment area and inadequate infrastructure. Notes that previous flood incidents highlight the need for infrastructure upgrades. Considers removal of trees and grass contradicts efforts to reduce carbon emissions. Considers that the basic rights impacted by high-density housing including consent of homeowners regarding adjacent property development, preservation of property value and avoidance of negative impacts on resale, rights to personal space, privacy, quietness, and unobstructed sunlight, preservation of peaceful and restful living conditions, including noise level considerations. and ensuring adequate space for children to play and feel safe. Notes the reasons to limit or reduce medium and high-density housing including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-High concentrations of people can lead to social issues such as crime and hopelessness.</li> <li>-Concerns about mental health, wellbeing, anxiety, and safety in densely populated areas.</li> <li>-Lack of sunlight affects both residents and gardens, impacting health.</li> <li>-Decreased land value can lead to feelings of entrapment and decreased mobility.</li> </ul>	Seeks a halt to plan in Napier/Hastings like Christchurch, more public consultation and public meetings, transparency, and retention of earthquake regulations, while imposing restrictions on building height in residential zones. Refer to original submissions for full details	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Andrea Hannah	266.1	Oppose	<p>Opposes the proposed medium density policies in Nelson Crescent as it fails to meet social cohesion objectives. Considers denser zoning on Nelson Crescent would undermine historic values and character. Nelson Cres and adjoining streets are not supported by a public transport system so in effect do not allow easy access to inner city amenities. 3 to 6 storey buildings will increase traffic and therefore noise and privacy will be lost as well as light to the existing one to two storey buildings. Street parking would increase and pose traffic disturbance. The hoped for 'social cohesion' is not fostered by density living as city life attests to</p>	Delete proposed Medium Density Residential Zoning in Nelson Crescent and to consider building multi-storey houses in areas which will not impact on existing old established areas.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P7: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Sarah Groom	267.1	Oppose	<p>Opposes the Medium Density Residential Zone and the Standards Table that outlines the criteria for Medium Density development considering intensified development will adversely impact the nature of neighbourhoods and suburbs. Opposes the intensification of Pirimai as a known flood zone considering the needs to upgrade stormwater networks with an allowable 80% impervious area and no requirement for stormwater retention or detention. Increased development, and subsequent impervious area, would only intensify stormwater runoff, contributing further to flooding in this area. Also considers the implications on insurance policies for residents. Refer to original submission for full reasons.</p>	Seeks the amendment of Medium Density Zone and reconsidered to take natural hazards in each area into account. Considers the need to ensure suburbs have the required amenities (shops, doctors, parks/rec facilities, schools etc) to service an influx of residents, consider which suburbs have the potential to grow not only housing numbers but have potential areas to grow facilities and amenities for quality neighbourhoods. Intensification to be in areas that have basic public amenities and not in areas with identified natural hazards such as flooding, as intensification will compound existing stormwater issues. Refer to original submission for further information.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Sarah Groom	267.2	Oppose	<p>Opposes the maximum height and height in relation to boundary as too imposing on the existing character of affected suburbs. Considers the loss of privacy, light, and enjoyment.</p>	Amend to reduce the maximum height of the MDZ to 2 storeys maximum to allow for intensification, while protecting existing character of neighbourhoods and the amenity of residents. Seeks the triggering of resource consent and inclusion of notification status where this is not met.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary	Sarah Groom	267.3	Oppose	<p>Opposes the maximum height and height in relation to boundary as too imposing on the existing character of affected suburbs. Considers the loss of privacy, light, and enjoyment.</p>	Maintain The existing 45° angle for height in relation to boundary at 3m above the existing ground line. Seeks the triggering of resource consent and inclusion of notification status where this is not met.	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential /General	Lindsay Manning David Chan	269.3	Oppose	<p>Considers that the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay needs to be extended to include all of Vigor Brown Street and McDonald Street between Carnell Street and Latham Street, and the Medium Density Residential Zone to exclude the entire area between Georges Drive, Carnell Street (both sides), Jull Street (both sides), and Nelson Crescent (both sides), rezoning this to General Residential for the following reasons:</p> <p>the Graham Linwood Heritage Character Report provides evidence of the areas heritage values and concludes that the both McDonald Street and Vigor Brown Street have high levels of authentic character;                      there is no difference in heritage character between the section of McDonald Street that is to be protected and the rest of the street and Vigor Brown Street;                      submitter was drawn to live in Napier South because of its heritage character; submitter has worked hard to renovate and maintain the property to preserve its heritage values;                      one modern high-rise apartment building (let alone many) would significantly impact on the heritage character values of the street;                      the policy direction set by the NPS:UD has been misconstrued and misapplied allowing high and/or medium density development in the area would result in loss of amenity, and transport and social cohesion issues</p>	Seeks the Medium Density Residential Zone in Napier South to exclude the entire area between Georges Drive, Kennedy Road, Nelson Crescent (both sides). This area should be General Residential.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential /General	Margie Clayton	270.2	Amend	Amend Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) to exclude McDonald Street and surrounding areas. Submitter brought their property with intentions of it being a forever home for them and their son, they have worked at maintaining the houses special character. Thinks the house and surrounding areas would be classified as special character homes and that this would protect those homes from MRZ. MRZ will impact sunlight, privacy, shade, and parking negatively.	Seeks to maintain McDonald Street, Vigor Brown Street and surrounding areas zone as general residential zones. Seeks to amend MRZ to remove McDonald Street, Vigor Brown Street and surrounding areas.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S1: Height	Dominic McClarey	275.2	Oppose	Objects to 12m and 19m High apartment blocks in Taradale, and commercial buildings in Taradale as this will result in a negative impact on character, privacy and sunlight access, an increase in traffic movements, and a reduction in the value of the submitters property. Objects to there being no car parking requirement and an increase in noise allowance. Objects to shoe-horning of development where there is old infrastructure, and a loss of green corridors.	Relief Sought is not included, however it is inferred that the submitter objects to the medium and high density residential zoning proposed in Taradale.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P2: Streets and public open space	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.112	Support	Support this policy as it promotes safe streets that encourage active transport within the neighbourhood.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P4: Quality living environments - within the site	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.113	Amend	Considers that multi-unit housing should be appropriately designed and insulated to mitigate noise effects from the existing environment in the interests of the human health of occupants. Considers that separation is often the best method for managing non-compatible land use and where separation is not possible, treatment is required to protect sensitive receivers.	Amend so that, where located in proximity to legally established activities that emit noise (such as State Highways), buildings for noise sensitive activities are designed to mitigate noise and vibration effects to occupants.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P7: Sustainable design and infrastructure	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.114	Support	Supports this policy as it ensures sufficient infrastructure provisions and/or mitigation measures are included in design.	Retain as notified	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /MRZ-R6: Retirement village premises	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.115	Amend	Supports in part R6 as the matters of discretion include: Infrastructure capacity and stormwater management, however, consider it should be amended to include the safety and efficiency of the transport network.	Amend to include Infrastructure capacity <u>including the safety and efficiency of the transport network.</u>	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /General	Kainga Ora - Brendon Liggett	285.4	Oppose	Opposes the use of the word 'maintain and enhance' within the purpose statements in the respective 'Standards Tables' of the GRZ, MRZ and HRZ.	Amend to refer to the 'planned built environment' in line with the objectives and policies of each zone and Policy 6 of the NPS-UD. The consequential requirement for development to 'maintain and enhance' the existing character of an area conflicts with the overall direction of the PDP to enable growth and intensification.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /MRZ-R1: Residential units and residential activity	Kainga Ora - Brendon Liggett	285.6	Amend	Seeks that the permitted number of dwellings be increased as follows:(a) MRZ-R1A – Increase the number of dwellings permitted on site within the MRZ from 1 to 3 dwellings; and	Increase the number of dwellings permitted on site within the MRZ from 1 to 3 dwellings	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S14: Maximum building length	Kainga Ora - Brendon Liggett	285.8	Oppose	Opposes MRZ-S14 and HRZ-S14 and seeks that these opposes MRZ-S14 and HRZ-S14 and seeks that these maximum building length standards of 22m are deleted. Considers that the purpose of this standard is to manage visual dominance; however, this is already appropriately managed by maximum heights, height in relation to boundary and yard setback standards. building length standards of 22m are deleted.	Delete maximum building length standards of 22m	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Assessment criteria /MRZ-AC1: Residential units (MRZ-R1); Relocated buildings (MRZ-R5); Retirement village premises (MRZ-R6)	Kainga Ora - Brendon Liggett	285.11	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the District Plan and seeks that reference to these are deleted. Considers that these act as de-facto rules to be complied with. Opposes any policy or rule approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Considers that Design Guidelines should be treated as a non- statutory tool and should sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. Seeks that any specific design guideline be relocated within a specific rule, matter of discretion or assessment criterion. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment. Notes that reference to design guidance that is regulated by another Council removes the ability for Council to adapt the guidance to reflect best practice and the planned built environment for the local urban environment of Napier City.	Delete reference to Design Guidelines in the District Plan	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P5: Urban character	Jason Geyer EJ Matthee Chantelle Van Schoor Faan and Esmarie Matthee	286.1	Support	Supports the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone and associated provisions in coverdale St and its surroundings. Considers that the proposed changes will assist in meeting the obligations under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD), in particular Policy 5 that seeks to enable building height and density of urban form that is commensurate with the level of accessibility and relative demand. Also considers that the provisions will deliver outcomes that are envisaged by the relevant objectives and policies within the MDRZ and higher order chapters within the PDP	Retain the Medium Density Residential Zone to most appropriately give effect to the higher order provisions in the PDP, the relevant objectives and policies within the MDRZ, and ultimately Part 2 of the Act. Seeks consequential amendments necessary to give effect to this submission, promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations and ensure the methods proposed are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Variation	Open Submission



# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.60	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency requires the ability to construct and operate emergency service facilities (i.e., fire stations) in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies. This means new fire stations may be necessary in any zone across the district in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the effects of a fire station can be largely anticipated and, in the most part, do not differ to the effects of many activities that may be anticipated through rural and urban environments.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency requests that emergency service facilities are provided for as permitted activities in the larger, more extensive zones of the district to recognise the critical importance of emergency services to communities. In providing for emergency service facility as a permitted activity would mean that emergency service facilities would be controlled by the subsequent performance standards of each zone (such as height, height in relation to boundary, front yards, building coverage requirements).and the other relevant performance standards in other chapters (i.e., transport) to ensure that any effects are appropriately managed.</p>	<p>Seeks to include new permitted activity as follows:</p> <p><u>xxx-Rx: Emergency service facilities</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status: Permitted</u> N/A</p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.</p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.78	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency's main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</p> <p>SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.</p> <p>In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and</p>	<p>Seeks to include a new performance standard as follows:</p> <p><u>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</u></p> <p><u>1. All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u></p> <p><u>2. Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p><u>Matter of discretion:</u></p> <p><u>1. The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p>	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.79	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency's main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</p> <p>SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.</p> <p>In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and</p>	<p>Seeks to include a new performance standard as follows:</p> <p><u>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</u></p> <p><u>1. All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u></p> <p><u>2. Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p><u>Matter of discretion:</u></p> <p><u>1. The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Alec Duncan	288.112	Support	Supports this objective as it seeks development and activities that contribute to the safety of communities. This would include emergency service facilities.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Objectives /MRZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Alec Duncan	288.113	Support	Supports MRZ-O5 insofar that it requires public health and environmental wellbeing be maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure. This would include firefighting water supply and access for Fire and Emergency operations.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P6: Non-residential activities	Alec Duncan	288.114	Amend	<p>Seeks that emergency service facilities be provided for as a permitted activity. This should be supported by GRZ-P6 to acknowledge the important role of emergency services in the community.</p> <p>Refer to submission for full details.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>MRZ-P6: Non-residential activities</p> <p>Limit non-residential activities in the zone to:</p> <p>a. prioritise efficient use of the zone for residential activities;</p> <p>b. minimise effects on the vitality of centre zones, <del>and</del></p> <p>c. minimise effects on residential amenity, and</p> <p><u>d. those that provide for the health, safety and wellbeing of the community.</u></p>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /Policies /MRZ-P7: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Alec Duncan	288.115	Support	Supports MRZ-P7 insofar that it seeks to ensure sufficient infrastructure provision and/or mitigation measures to accommodate demand. This would include firefighting water supply and access for Fire and Emergency operations.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S3: Front yards	Alec Duncan	288.116	Amend	Seeks the inclusion of a new matter of discretion to provide NCC the ability to consider the risk of non-compliance with MRZ-S3 on emergency service access. It is important that emergency service access, suitable for Fire and Emergency personnel, is provided at site boundaries, as well as provision for emergency egress by residents.	<p>Add a new matter of discretion to MRZ-S3 as follows</p> <p><u>:x. The ability for emergency services to safely and efficient access the site.</u></p>	Open Submission

# MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S4: Other yards	Alec Duncan	288.117	Amend	Seeks the inclusion of a new matter of discretion to provide NCC the ability to consider the risk of non-compliance with MRZ-S4 on emergency service access. It is important that emergency service access, suitable for Fire and Emergency personnel, is provided at site boundaries, as well as provision for emergency egress by residents.	Add a new matter of discretion to MRZ-S4 as follows:  <u>x. The ability for emergency services to safely and efficient access the site.</u>	Open Submission
MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone /MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /MRZ-S14: Maximum building length	Alec Duncan	288.118	Amend	<p>A significant concern relating to medium density residential developments is the use of long, narrow sections and associated pedestrian accessways as the sole access to most units and where backyards are only accessed through the units themselves. The length of these accessways can cause delays in accessing rear units and require extra personnel to lay out hose lengths around corners and support with the extra weight of hoses. This in turn would impact water pressure available at the delivery to the fire site.</p> <p>The narrowness of side boundaries and subsequent accessways can also cause conflict between emergency personnel reaching an emergency, residents attempting to evacuate, and other emergency personnel needs (e.g., St John transporting patients). This scale of response would prove very difficult to accommodate along 1m wide side boundaries. In terms of resident safety, this can mean impeded or delayed evacuation. In many cases if a fire or emergency (such as hazardous substance) were to occur in a middle unit, this would trap all units further to the rear from being evacuated without removing fences and infrastructure to get individuals out through neighbouring sites. Depending on individual site maintenance arrangements, it is possible that communal areas like pedestrian accessways have locked gates added or are neglected and planting and other barriers or outdoor furniture further obstruct the usable width of the side boundary or accessway.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency supports this performance standard to the extent that it sets a maximum length of a building to 22m, after which shall provide a minimum separation of 4m between any other building on the same site. However, Fire and Emergency considers that the 4m separation should also</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>1. The maximum length of a building above ground floor level shall be 22 m, measured parallel to side and rear boundaries, after which there shall be a minimum separation of 4 m between any other building on the same site <u>and the side boundary of which the main pedestrian access route to the residential units are provided.</u></p> <p>Add a new matter of discretion as follows:</p> <p><u>4. The ability for emergency services to safely and efficient access the site.</u></p>	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential /	Robert Bell	4.1	Oppose	Opposes this zone.	To delete mapping and provisions related to the High Density Residential Zone  [Inferred relief]	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Ann Webster	8.2	Oppose	The submitter opposes the medium and high density residential zones as it is inconsistent with the existing surroundings and built environment. The submitter states the proposed building heights creates issues as they reduce privacy for neighbours, difficulty in maintenance, and concern for increased development if neighbouring properties sell. The submitter states concern that the new zones and provisions give unfair advantage to developers who may not protect the interests of the neighbourhood.	Delete the proposed height provisions that allow for 3 storey dwellings in the Medium and High Density Residential zones. The submitter seeks the allowance of increased height provisions for new subdivisions only.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S8: Fences and walls	Sarah Cotter	18.1	Oppose	Opposes High Density Residential (HRZ) fence height restrictions.	Delete HRZ fence height restrictions.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone / /	Bevaleah RYE	19.1	Oppose	Wellesley residential area is an area that is already struggling with the traffic, noise, parking with Health Centre and MSD buildings. There are also significant social issues in this area. Increasing the density in this area will further exacerbate these issues.	Amend to exclude the Wellesley Rd area from the high density zone.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S8: Fences and walls	Susan Dallas	25.4	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.(Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S8: Fences and walls	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.4	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Liz Marshall	33.1	Oppose	Considers the High Density Residential provisions as written, to impact negatively on the enjoyment of individuals homes, and to have impacts on amenity.	Amend provisions so that high density residential to is established on the same road, on both sides of the road.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential /	Graham Morton	37.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) at Vigor Brown Street and Napier South. Considers that intensification will result in the loss of character older housing stock, amenity and a lack of onsite parking will result in traffic effects with public safety concerns.	Seeks deletion of HRZ from Vigor Brown Street and Napier South.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential /General	Kevin Corkery	38.1	Oppose	Considers the HRZ will create inappropriate multi-unit development leading to reduced existing property values, loss of amenity and opposes the preclusion of HRZ notification in HRZ-R1B, shading of private properties, and lack of noise standards.	Seeks deletion of HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) in its entirety.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Michael Wilkin	39.1	Oppose	Considers the HRZ in Vigor Brown Street will result in a loss of character, sunlight, privacy, safety, existing property value and noise and street parking increases. HRZ-S1: Height limits are too high and will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity for McDonald Street.	Seeks deletion of HRZ from Vigor Brown Street.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential /	Aaron Killick	41.1	Oppose	Considers the HRZ will create inappropriate multi-unit development for nos. 34-42 McDonald Street and the opposite side of the street leading to character housing loss, loss of amenity, parking and traffic safety concerns.	Seeks McDonald Street from Kennedy Road to Latham Street as a Historic Heritage Overlay (OVR). Or else rezone McDonald Street from High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) to Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ).	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential /	greg primrose	45.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) given the present lack of analysis for the anticipated and planned built form of the Zone.	Reject HRZ from the PDP.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /General /General	Julie Chambers	53.1	Oppose	Opposes HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) at Kennedy Road. Considers intensification will result in the loss of amenity, exacerbate existing infrastructure deficits, and lead to a lack of onsite parking.	Seeks upgrading of infrastructure and parking. Inferred decision requested regarding the deletion of HRZ from Kennedy Road.	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Beverly & Martin Lott	57.1	Oppose	Considers No. 21a Elbourne St zoned Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) and neighbouring 19 Elbourne St zoned High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) will result in a loss of character, sunlight, privacy, existing property values and increase noise, traffic and parking demand. Opposes the preclusion of consultation of neighbouring property owners upon development taking place and the rezoning of existing and longstanding neighbourhoods. HRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity to provide for additional height and density in areas in the HRZ is opposed.	Seeks deletion of MRZ and HRZ from existing and established neighbourhoods and that intensification is restricted to greenfield sites.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O1: Housing supply and diversity	Peter Smith	62.1	Oppose	Opposes the zoning of 5a Taradale Road as a HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) and associated provisions including HRZ-O1: Housing supply and diversity. Considers the site has issues with vehicle / pedestrian crossing safety due to the railway crossing, Taradale Road (State Highway) access and roundabout proximity / visibility in addition to potential infrastructural limitations.	Delete HRZ provisions (including HRZ-O1: Housing supply and diversity) from 5a Taradale Road and rezone appropriately.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Policies /HRZ-P7: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Wayne Ormsby	63.8	Amend	Considers that the standard approach to stormwater management for high and medium density housing is not sufficient and that more nature-based stormwater management systems and on-site retention should be encouraged and provided for.	Seeks to restrict impervious surfaces for development to 40% of the site area, and to include a condition of resource consent that requires eco-friendly water design.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /General /General	Michelle Elaine Waterfall	65.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) at No. 5 Elbourne Street, Taradale and MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) along Elbourne Street. Considers that while intensification will increase Taradale economic activity, it is inappropriate given the existing residential character.	Seeks deletion of HRZ and MRZ zoning from Elbourne Street, Taradale.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Siobhan Leah-Jane	67.1	Oppose	Submitter considers the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) and MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in and around Taradale Village will result in a loss of character, public safety and amenity. Intensification will result in the irrevocable loss of King Street's special character, amenity and sense of place.	Seeks at a minimum, consultation / notification provisions not being precluded for neighbouring properties that are adversely affected / shaded by new MRZ and HRZ development in / around Taradale Village and King Street so as to identify adverse effects and potential mitigation to address local conditions. The proposal as notified is inconsistent with HRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity outcomes.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Erica Jit	70.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) as being inconsistent with HRZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure at Carnell Street. Considers HRZ intensification in non-pedestrian friendly neighbourhoods will result in increased traffic effects and resultant public safety concerns generally and specifically around Carnell, Carlyle, Thackeray streets, Kennedy Rd and Georges Drive where there are schools with school and preschool children.	Seeks deletion of HRZ from Carnell, Carlyle, Thackeray streets, Kennedy Rd and Georges Drive due to increased traffic potentially affecting people and communities health and safety due to a lack of pedestrian infrastructure and the presence of school / preschool children.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Jonathan Mumford	75.2		Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) at 1/1 Peddie Street, 50 D Puketapu Road, Taradale and Greenmeadows villages will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, road reserve greenspace, business and commercial demand, poor residential design and a lack of social cohesion. HRZ Standards such as HRZ-S1 height limits are too high and will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increased street parking, vehicle movements, congestion, pollution, noise, impervious areas, inadequate infrastructure, depopulation, natural hazard risk. Greenfield land should be used for development instead.	Delete MRZ and HRZ provisions (including HRZ-S1: Height) from Taradale, Greenmeadows and Napier City and reconsider development locations.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S13: Minimum residential unit size	Jonathan Mumford	75.6	Oppose	Opposes HRZ-S13: Minimum residential unit size Standard as the submitter considers it will result in unhealthy, overcrowded dwellings with a resultant loss of sunlight, privacy, traffic safety and an increase in vehicle movements, pollution, noise, rental properties and depopulation out of Napier City for lifestyle reasons.	Delete HRZ-S13 (Minimum residential unit size) in its entirety.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary	Jonathan Mumford	75.7	Oppose	Considers that HRZ recession plane requirements will not manage shading, sunshine and the increase in the number of residents will result in more vehicle movements, traffic safety, air and noise pollution.	Seeks that HRZ-S2: height in relation to boundary is deleted.(Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O3: Quality living environments	Leigh Mitchley	76.1	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) at Peddie Street, Taradale and Greenmeadows will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, accessibility, sense of community, as well as inadequate infrastructure. The HRZ-O3: Quality living environments Objective will not be achieved and intensification will instead lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increased rentals, isolation and inequality.	Delete MRZ and HRZ provisions (including HRZ-O3: Quality living environments) from Taradale and Greenmeadows and Council to reconsider development options.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Rick Neil Jamieson	77.1	Oppose	Considers both the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street, Taradale and Greenmeadows will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, devalue existing Peddie Street property values and result in commercial building typologies. MRZ and HRZ Standards such as HRZ-S1: Height standards will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increased noise to 70dB all night, street parking and vehicle movement pressure.	Seeks that Peddie Street, Taradale and Greenmeadows are exempt from intensification in the MRZ and HRZ as notified.(Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /	Peter Grant	78.1	Amend	Supports enabling greater housing diversity to meet the needs of growing older populations, with choices near services and amenities. Considers the option for medium and high density zones dedicated for older people with communal areas. Considers choices needs to use Crime Prevention Through Safer Environmental Design principles for connection and safety.	Amend objectives to incentivize developers to meet requirements for Universal Design for older residents. Consider enabling a greater site coverage where Universal Design Standards are met.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /	Peter Grant	78.2	Support	Supports protection of parks and reserves through open space and natural space zones to retain green spaces for Napier, as housing density increases. Consider the need for open spaces for older people in higher density areas with limited space onsite.	No relief sought or inferred	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Policies	Peter Grant	78.3	Support	Supports policy to enabling greater housing diversity to meet the needs of growing older populations, with choices near services and amenities. Considers the option for medium and high density zones dedicated for older people with communal areas. Considers choices needs to use Crime Prevention Through Safer Environmental Design principles for connection and safety.	No relief sought or inferred	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Policies /	Peter Grant	78.5	Amend	Considers policy should state requirements for accesible and mobility permit parking in developments in high density areas. Considers universal design is essential to enablin equitable access for older limited mobility residents.	Amend to require Safe and accessible parking areas to provide access to mobility car parking and mobility scooter parking, and e-charging for both.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives	Peter Grant	78.9	Amend	Supports enabling greater housing diversity to meet the needs of growing older populations, with choices near services and amenities. Considers the option for medium and high density zones dedicated for older people with communal areas. Considers choices needs to use Crime Prevention Through Safer Environmental Design principles for connection and safety. (Refer original submission for case study)	Amend objectives to incentivize developers to meet requirements for Universal Design for older residents. Consider enabling a greater site coverage where Universal Design Standards are met.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Policies	Peter Grant	78.10	Amend	Supports protection of parks and reserves through open space and natural space zones to retain green spaces for Napier, particularly as housing density increases. Higher density housing areas will introduce a need for open spaces so older people (and the wider population) can exercise and enjoy the outdoors, particularly if properties have limited outdoor space on site.	Amend objectives to rovide for minimum public open space zones, which are easily accessible, in high density residential areas.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S8: Fences and walls	Peter Grant	78.18	Support	Supports the proposed standards for fences and walls. Safety and visibility from and to the street are important for older people, particularly for those living alone. Social connections within neighbourhoods are important and lower fence heights go some way towards achieving this. Passive surveillance of the streetscape also helps with crime prevention.	Incorporate design guidelines to ensure utilisation of appropriate fence design and products.	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Joanne Black	79.1	Oppose	Opposes proposed high-density residential zoning in Napier South. Considers that the the character and history of Vigor Brown St should be preserved and protected by making the area of Vigor Brown Street between Carnell Street to Kennedy Road and Kennedy Road to Latham Street, along with Winifred Street, a general residential zone with the addition of a heritage overlay. Considers the significance of homes dating back over 100 years having survived 1931 earthquake. Considers that the building of up to a 19.5 metre apartment style dwelling next to a 100 year old Villa would completely spoil the history and character of the homes in the area. Refers to the report by architect Graham Linwood on Napier's heritage character areas which emphasizes the historic value and character of Napier South's built environment. Consider that there is concern for potential alteration of character due to attractiveness to developers for medium-density housing. Considers that councils proposed zoning disregards this report as there is no difference between the two streets with regards to the historic qualities and style and era of housing.	Amend proposed high density zone for Vigor Brown Street & Winifred Street in Napier South, to be zoned General residential with a historic overlay, like MacDonald Street between Carnell Street and Kennedy Road. Considers that there is no difference in the history or character of the homes in these streets and the council itself commissioned a report in 2019 by registered architect Graham Linwood (Heritage Review) which concluded this.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Issues /	Paul O'Shaughnessy	84.1	Oppose	Opposes the zoning of 1, 5, 7, 9, 13, 15 and 15A Wellesley Road, 1 Kennedy Road, and 9 and 11 Owen Street as High Density Residential.	Amend the zoning of 1, 5, 7, 9, 13, 15 and 15A Wellesley Road, 1 Kennedy Road, and 9 and 11 Owen Street to Mixed Use Zone.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Dr. Hans-Hasso Weichbrodt	87.1	Oppose	Opposes the High Density Residential Zoning in Taradale and Peddie Street. Considers the proposed zone would have adverse effects to life and environment more traffic, more noise, possibly more crime etc. Also considers the existing two-storey buildings and subdivisions and that any higher density would surely destroy the character of our beautiful neighbourhood.	Remove the proposed High Density Zone in Peddie Street and Taradale.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Jan-Gesa Weichbrodt-Borm	88.1	Oppose	Opposes the High Density Residential Zoning in Taradale and Peddie Street. Considers the proposed zone would have adverse effects to life and environment more traffic, more noise, possibly more crime etc. Also considers the existing two-storey buildings and subdivisions and that any higher density would surely destroy the character of our beautiful neighbourhood.	Remove the proposed High Density Zone in Peddie Street and Taradale.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Odette Charlotte Potgieter Henry George Potgieter	90.2	Oppose	Considers the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, No. 40a Peddie Street property value and result in commercial building typologies. HRZ Standards such as HRZ-S1 height limits are too high and together with a lack of carparking and 1.5m front yard setbacks will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increased noise, street parking, vehicle movements, congestion, infrastructure deficits and loss of road reserve and property greenspace.	Seeks consultation with residents and that Taradale is exempt from intensification in the HRZ as notified.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Rosemary Anne Kirby Gregory John Kirby	91.1	Oppose		Seeks consultation with residents and that Peddie Street and Taradale are exempt from intensification in the MRZ and HRZ as notified.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Ross Dobbie Eileen Dobbie	92.1	Oppose		Seeks consultation with residents and that Peddie Street, Taradale and Greenmeadows are exempt from intensification in the MRZ and HRZ as notified.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Ross Dobbie Eileen Dobbie	93.1	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street, Taradale and Greenmeadows will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, existing Peddie Street property values (Nos. 31 and 26 Peddie Street) and result in commercial building typologies. MRZ and HRZ Standards such as HRZ-S1: Height standards will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increased noise, street parking and vehicle movement pressure.	Seeks consultation with residents and that Peddie Street, Taradale and Greenmeadows are deleted from intensification in the MRZ and HRZ as notified.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /General /General	Jean Ferguson	94.1	Oppose	Considers HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) in Winifred Street and Napier South will result in a loss of sunlight and privacy. HRZ Standards such as HRZ-S1: Height standards allowing for 6 storey apartments will lead to an increase in noise, street parking demand and vehicle movement congestion.	Delete HRZ from Winifred Street and Napier South and retain the status quo.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Jean Ferguson	94.2	Oppose	Opposes HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) provisions such as the HRZ-S1: Height Standard allowing for 6 storey apartments in the residential area of Napier South.	Delete HRZ from residential Napier South and instead maintain 1-2 storey height limit.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Jean Ferguson	94.3	Oppose	Considers the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) in Winifred Street and Napier South will result in increased vehicle movement, loss of street parking and resulting public safety concerns, shading, privacy and noise.HRZ-O2: Community wellbeing is contrary to HRZ intensification. resultant lack of carparking, inadequate public transport, increased vehicle movement, special needs and different individual accessibility and familial requirements. It risks community wellbeing through the loss of neighbourhood character and amenity.	Opposes Winifred Street and Napier South being classified as HRZ with a Height limit of 19.5m. Retain 1-2 storey high limit.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Cameron David Marett	98.1	Oppose	Considers both the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, devalue existing Peddie Street property values (No. 32 Peddie Street) and result in commercial building typologies. MRZ and HRZ Standards such as HRZ-S1: Height standards will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increased noise, street parking, infrastructure deficits and vehicle movement pressure resulting in congestion and the blocking of arterials and State Highways.	Seeks Peddie Street and Taradale are exempt from intensification in the MRZ and HRZ as notified.(Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Cameron David Marett	98.11	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increased noise, street parking and vehicle movement pressure. MRZ and HRZ Standards such as HRZ-S1: Height standards will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, existing Peddie Street property values (No. 32 Peddie Street) and result in commercial building typologies.	Seeks deletion of MRZ and HRZ provisions from Peddie Street and Taradale.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Introduction /	Summerset Group Holdings Limited Summerset Group Holdings Limited	103.15	Amend	Considers that the introduction does not acknowledge the retirement villages significant accommodation/housing typology that contributes to the provision of a diverse range of housing demands, community wellbeing, and service freeing up land vacated by the elderly population when moving into a retirement village . Considers that the PDP could better align with NPSUD in providing for a range of housing types, including the specific needs of older persons in a way which is more enabling, relative to the characteristics and requirements of retirement village activities through intensification in the existing urban environment. Also considers that the PDP could provide opportunity for such development/activity through rezoning by identifying greenfield land that is suitable for urban development by providing for a 'Future Urban Zone' framework.	No specific relief stated. To add retirement-village specific objective, policy and rule framework for each of the residential zones to better address the NPSUD to enable the provision of a diverse range of retirement housing and care options in the District  [Inferred Relief].  Refer to full submission attachment for reasons	Open Submission



# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Issues /	Summerset Group Holdings Limited Summerset Group Holdings Limited	103.16	Amend	The demand for retirement village accommodation outstrips supply. The release of family homes back into the housing market annually through new retirement village builds represents a significant contribution to easing the chronic housing shortage.Considers that the PDP could better align with NPSUD in providing for a range of housing types, including the specific needs of older persons in a way which is more enabling, relative to the characteristics and requirements of retirement village activities through intensification in the existing urban environment. Also considers that the PDP could provide opportunity for such development/activity through rezoning by identifying greenfield land that is suitable for urban development by providing for a 'Future Urban Zone' framework.Refer to original submission for full reasons in attachment.	No specific relief stated.  Refer to original submission for full reasons in attachment.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /	Summerset Group Holdings Limited Summerset Group Holdings Limited	103.17	Amend	Considers that the PDP could better align with NPSUD in providing for a range of housing types, including the specific needs of older persons in a way which is more enabling, relative to the characteristics and requirements of retirement village activities through intensification in the existing urban environment. Also considers that the PDP could provide opportunity for such development/activity through rezoning by identifying greenfield land that is suitable for urban development by providing for a 'Future Urban Zone' framework.Considers that the provisions fail to appropriately distinguish and recognise the functional and operational attributes of retirement villages.	Amend to include retirement-village specific objective, policy and rule framework for the High Density Residential Zone to better address the NPSUD to enable the provision of a diverse range of retirement housing and care options in the District.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Policies /	Summerset Group Holdings Limited Summerset Group Holdings Limited	103.18	Amend	Considers that the PDP could better align with NPSUD in providing for a range of housing types, including the specific needs of older persons in a way which is more enabling, relative to the characteristics and requirements of retirement village activities through intensification in the existing urban environment. Also considers that the PDP could provide opportunity for such development/activity through rezoning by identifying greenfield land that is suitable for urban development by providing for a 'Future Urban Zone' framework.Considers that the provisions fail to appropriately distinguish and recognise the functional and operational attributes of retirement villages	Amend to add retirement-village specific objective, policy and rule framework for each of the High Density Residential Zone to better address the NPSUD to enable the provision of a diverse range of retirement housing and care options in the District  [[Inferred Relief].	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /HRZ-R6: Retirement village premises	Summerset Group Holdings Limited Summerset Group Holdings Limited	103.19	Amend	Supports the restricted discretionary activity classification for 'Retirement village premises' in the High Density Residential Zone however, seeks that these activities are precluded from both public and limited notification.	No specific relief sought. Amend Rule HRZ-R6 to provide a preclusion for retirement villages to be notified on a public or limited basis [Inferred Relief].  Refer to full submission for details.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /	Summerset Group Holdings Limited Summerset Group Holdings Limited	103.20	Amend	[List]	Delete the following standards for retirement villages:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Residential outlook space;</li> <li>▲ Minimum residential unit size;</li> <li>▲ Outdoor living space;</li> <li>▲ Windows to the street;</li> <li>▲ Landscaped area;</li> <li>▲ Maximum building length.</li> </ul> Seeks amendment to provide specific standards and specific assessment framework for retirement villages which consider the location of this activity on large sites allow for amenities different to that of standard residential dwelling.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Assessment criteria /	Summerset Group Holdings Limited Summerset Group Holdings Limited	103.21	Amend	Considers it inappropriate for retirement villages to be subject to the same assessment matters/criteria as general residential developments, which exceed one unit per site, or for retirement villages to be subject to the same 'standards' that apply to residential units.	Seeks amendment to provide specific standards and specific assessment framework for retirement villages which also consider the location of this activity on large sites allow for amenities different to that of a standard residential dwelling.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Kevin Corkery	104.1	Oppose	Opposes the proposed rezoning of Taradale to medium and high density zones to protect against crime and lowering of property value.	Remove the medium and high density zones in Taradale.	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /HRZ-R1: Residential units and residential activity	Andrea Millar	105.13	Support	Supports the permitted activity rules applying to “residential units” and “residential activity” in the zone as appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided by Ara Poutama.	Retain permitted activity rule HRZ-R1 applying to “residential units”	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Lynette Harris	106.1	Amend	<p>Submitter objects to the proposed changes in the PDP. Submitter was born in Napier and has lived on Peddie Street for many years, is a pensioner who has made alterations to their home and enjoys living in the quiet peaceful and safe area.</p> <p>Objects to, 19.5m high apartment blocks being built in Taradale and Greenmeadows, 12m high apartment blocks being built in Taradale and Greenmeadows, Commercial buildings being built in Taradale and Greenmeadows, No allowance for off street parking, Reduced privacy and sunlight, Increased vehicle movement, Increased noise to 70db all night; and The loss of neighbourhood character.</p> <p>Submitter is stressed about their future and believes it is unnecessary as vacant land exists in Napier.</p>	Relief Sought is not included, however inferred relief sought is that the submitter wants Taradale and Greenmeadows to be zoned as General Residential.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O3: Quality living environments	Lynette Harris	106.3	Amend	<p>Submitter objects to the proposed changes in the PDP. Submitter was born in Napier and has lived on Peddie Street for many years, is a pensioner who has made alterations to their home and enjoys living in the quiet peaceful and safe area.</p> <p>Objects to, 19.5m high apartment blocks being built in Taradale and Greenmeadows, 12m high apartment blocks being built in Taradale and Greenmeadows, Commercial buildings being built in Taradale and Greenmeadows, No allowance for off street parking, Reduced privacy and sunlight, Increased vehicle movement, Increased noise to 70db all night; and The loss of neighbourhood character.</p> <p>Submitter is stressed about their future and believes it is unnecessary as vacant land exists in Napier.</p>	Relief Sought is not included, however it is inferred that the submitter seeks the area around Peddie Street to be rezoned General Residential (not HRZ).	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Lynette Harris	106.6	Amend	<p>Submitter objects to the proposed changes in the PDP. Submitter was born in Napier and has lived on Peddie Street for many years, is a pensioner who has made alterations to their home and enjoys living in the quiet peaceful and safe area. Objects to, 19.5m high apartment blocks being built in Taradale and Greenmeadows, 12m high apartment blocks being built in Taradale and Greenmeadows, Commercial buildings being built in Taradale and Greenmeadows, No allowance for off street parking, Reduced privacy and sunlight, Increased vehicle movement, Increased noise to 70db all night; and The loss of neighbourhood character. Submitter is stressed about their future and believes it is unnecessary as vacant land exists in Napier.</p>	Relief Sought is not included, however it is inferred that the submitter seeks the area around Peddie Street to be rezoned General Residential (not HRZ).	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Lilian Sandra Winnie	107.1	Oppose	Opposes a maximum building height of 19.5m for Taradale.	No specific relief sought. Seeking amendment to standard to reduce maximum building height limit in Taradale [Inferred].	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone //General	Amy Dove	110.1	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) to exclude Napier South, particularly Carnell Street. Considers impact on light, privacy, noise, aesthetic, house values, traffic, parking, safety of school students and the overall wellbeing of residents. Considers that the street has character homes which are part of art deco tours, and that 6 storey buildings will impact the feel of the street. Considers the street is used as racetrack and proposes HRZ will worsen this. Submitter has not been consulted or informed on the proposal or impacts.	Seeks to Amend HRZ to exclude Carnell Street from HRZ or change the height of buildings within an HRZ.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Cameron David Marett	111.1	Oppose	Opposes building and structures height of 19.5m	No specific relief sought. Seeking amendment for a reduction in building height limited [Inferred].	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone //	Lawrence and Kerryn Yule	112.1	Oppose	Submission points have been summarised as specific points under submission points 112.2-5	Relief sought points have been summarised as specific points under submission points 112.2-5	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Lawrence and Kerryn Yule	112.5	Oppose	Opposes performance standard for a maximum height of 19.5m and six-storey buildings in Napier.	Amend the maximum height limits to facilitate a maximum of 3-storeys throughout Napier.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Policies /HRZ-P5: Urban character	Sheena Revington Peter Revington	114.1	Amend	Considers allowing up to six storey residential buildings in Napier South, specifically in Vigor Brown Street would destroy the character of the area. States that only 3-4 years ago the street was proposed to be a special character area, preventing further development.	Amend to protect the special character of Vigor Brown Street by not allowing multi storey developments.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Policies /HRZ-P5: Urban character	Philip Leake	116.1	Oppose	Oppose medium and high density housing in Napier South and 6 storey residential housing on Winifred Street, considering impacts to privacy, shade, safety and parking.	Retain current general residential settings of 1-2 storey's in Napier South and keep large areas of Bungalows and Villas in tact.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /HRZ-R1: Residential units and residential activity	Kate Graham	119.2	Amend	Amend Rule HRZ-R1A to the match the equivalent permitted activity rule in the General Residential zone (GRZ-R1A) - one residential unit per site and include a new permitted activity rule (HRZ-R1B) which permits minor residential units in the High Density Residential zone with the same wording as GRZ-R3A. The reason for this requested amendment to HRZ-R1A and the addition of HRZ-R1B is the proposed High Density Residential zone currently comprises existing development – all new development in the High Density Residential zone is infill / brown fields development. Submits that existing residents should be able to build a minor dwelling – i.e. a granny flat on their existing properties as a permitted activity. As our population changes different types of brownfield development / growth will be required – this will include increasing multi generational living. By not allowing minor dwellings as a permitted activity within the High Density Residential zone multi generational living will be unachievable.	Amend Rule HRZ-R1A as follows:  one residential unit per site  <del>Note: Minor residential units are considered standard residential units subject to this rule within the High Density Residential Zone.</del>  and include a new permitted activity rule HRZ-R1B - minor residential unit, which permits minor residential units in the High Density Residential zone with the same wording as GRZ-R3A:  "Activity Status: Permitted  Where:  <u>One minor residential unit per site, and</u>  <u>The gross floor area of the unit does not exceed 80m<sup>2</sup>.</u>	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Shirley Rosina Carrington	121.1	Oppose	Considers the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) and MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, depreciation of the existing No. 5 Peddie Street property value and result in commercial building typologies. Objective HRZ-O2: Community wellbeing is inconsistent with a lack of personal safety, social wellbeing, connectivity, inequality, carparking that will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with noise, street parking (given there is no allowance for intensification), vehicle movements, foot traffic, congestion and exacerbation of existing infrastructural deficits.	Seeks Peddie Street and Taradale are exempt from intensification in the HRZ and MRZ as notified.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Policies /HRZ-P7: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Shirley Rosina Carrington	121.2	Oppose	Considers the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) and MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, depreciation of the existing No. 5 Peddie Street property value and result in commercial building typologies. Policy HRZ-P7: Sustainable design and infrastructure is inconsistent with the building of more houses given existing infrastructural deficits as well as the lack of personal safety, social wellbeing, connectivity, inequality, carparking that will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with noise, street parking (given there is no allowance for intensification), vehicle movements, foot traffic and congestion.	Delete HRZ-P7: Sustainable design and infrastructure as being contrary to the HRZ intensification provisions outcomes and seeks Peddie Street and Taradale are exempt from intensification in the HRZ and MRZ as notified.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Shirley Rosina Carrington	121.4	Oppose	Considers the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) and MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, depreciation of their existing No. 5 Peddie Street property value and result in commercial building typologies. HRZ Standards such as HRZ-S1 height limits are too high and will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with a loss of sunlight and privacy, increased street parking, vehicle movements, foot traffic, congestion, noise, inadequate infrastructure and the loss of openness.	Delete MRZ and HRZ provisions (including HRZ-S1: Height) from Peddie Street and Taradale as notified.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Shirley Rosina Carrington	121.7	Oppose	Considers the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) and MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, depreciation of the existing No. 5 Peddie Street property value and result in commercial building typologies. Objective HRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity of integrated neighbourhoods is inconsistent with a lack of sunlight, privacy, personal safety, social wellbeing, connectivity, inequality, carparking that will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with noise, street parking (given there is no allowance for intensification), vehicle movements, foot traffic, congestion and exacerbation of existing infrastructural deficits for an increased population.	Seeks that Peddie Street and Taradale are exempt from intensification (including HRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity) provisions in the HRZ and MRZ as notified.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Janet Anne Neill Abby Olivia Neill	127.5	Oppose	Amend High Density Residential (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential (MRZ) for Taradale, particularly King Street. Submitter is opposed due to social impacts, on both health and well-being of residents. Is concerned about impacts on flooding, stormwater, noise, traffic, parking, green spaces, sunlight, privacy and loss of community. Submitter is directly impacted by the plan.	Relief Sought is not included, however it is inferred that the submitter seeks to have the area of Taradale around King Street reverted back to a General Residential Zone (not MRZ or HRZ).	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Sandra Esther Wilson	129.1	Amend	Amend High Density Residential (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential (MRZ) for Taradale, particularly Elbourne Street. Submitter is opposed due to social impacts, on both health and well-being of residents. Is concerned about impacts on noise, traffic, loss of green spaces, birdlife, character, sunlight, privacy, community, parking, anti-social behaviour, wind issues and the value of properties.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Sandra Esther Wilson	129.2	Amend	Amend High Density Residential (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential (MRZ) for Taradale, particularly Elbourne Street. Submitter is opposed due to social impacts, on both health and well-being of residents. Is concerned about impacts on noise, traffic, loss of green spaces, birdlife, character, sunlight, privacy, community, parking, anti-social behaviour, wind issues and the value of properties. Particular focus on loss of trees, green spaces, birdlike, natural sunlight, privacy and community.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential /General	Kim Hunter	130.1	Oppose	Considers the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) at 9A Peddie Street, Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, outlook, anticipatory decreased house values and a lack of personal safety. HRZ height limits for 6 storey apartments are too high and will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increased street parking, noise, vehicle movements and congestion. The submission process should be extended and simplified.	Delete HRZ and MRZ in their entirety for existing neighbourhoods and reconsider greenfield development locations with appropriate infrastructure.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Kim Hunter	130.3	Oppose	Considers the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) at 9A Peddie Street, Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, outlook, anticipatory decreased house values and a lack of personal safety. Standard HRZ-S1 height limits for their property are too high and will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity without consultation with neighbouring property owners, increased street parking, noise, vehicle movements and congestion. The submission process should be extended and simplified.	Delete HRZ and MRZ in their entirety for existing neighbourhoods and reconsider greenfield development locations with appropriate infrastructure.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O3: Quality living environments	Kim Hunter	130.4	Oppose	Considers the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) at 9A Peddie Street, Taradale will not achieve the HRZ-O3: Quality living environments Objective and intensification will instead lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy and outlook.	Delete HRZ and MRZ provisions in their entirety (including HRZ-O3: Quality living environments) from existing neighbourhoods and reconsider greenfield development locations with fit for purpose infrastructure and amenity.	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Andrea Furness	132.5	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) in Elbourne Street, Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character and result in commercial multi-storey and low-rise apartments incongruous building typologies. HRZ Standards such as HRZ-S1 height limits are too high and will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with a loss of sunlight and privacy, increased street parking, vehicle movements, congestion, noise, inadequate infrastructure and the loss of greenspace and birdlife.	Delete MRZ and HRZ provisions (including HRZ-S1: Height) from Elbourne Street, Taradale.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential /	Carl & Rebecca Berryman	140.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) provisions for Vigor Brown and McDonald Street between Kennedy Road and Carnell Street. Considers that intensification will result in the loss of significant character / heritage residential architecture (as per the Napier Heritage Character Study 2019 that identified 89% of homes contained significantly high levels of heritage houses) due to proposed six-storey apartment bulk, scale and form upon the streetscape, loss of privacy, increased shade, lack of onsite parking, roading infrastructure pressure, residents' declining property restoration investment and their social well-being. (The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)	Seeks deletion of HRZ in Napier South for all of the area within Georges Drive, Kennedy Road, Carnell Street and Jull Street. Together with the designation of Historic Heritage Overlay status for Vigor Brown Street and McDonald Street, between Kennedy Road and Carnell Street.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential /General	Robina Anne Tipiwai	141.5	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /HRZ-R1: Residential units and residential	Pip Beachen	142.8	Support	Supports the retention of a Restricted Discretionary Activity Status where activity conditions are not met, including new houses on small vacant sites and/or multiple residential units on a site. Aalso supports the default non-notification for applications under this rule on both a public and limited basis.	Retain HRZ-R1.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Assessment criteria /HRZ-AC1: Residential units (HRZ-R1); Relocated buildings (HRZ-R5); Retirement village premises (HRZ-R6)	Pip Beachen	142.9	Oppose	Opposes the introduction of the Hastings Residential Intensification Design Guide into the statutory assessment process. Considers it is a useful tool to achieve quality design outcomes, however would introduce an additional layer of subjectivity and uncertainty. Seeks it's retention as a non-statutory guidance document only, with resource consents to be assessed against concise 'material' development criteria in the District Plan.	Delete Assessment Criteria HRZ-AC1(g) and (q). Supports the retention of the remaining assessment criteria (a) – (f), (h) – (p), (r) and (s).	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary	Pip Beachen	142.11	Amend	Considers that it is important that the standards appropriately facilitate the outcomes sought by Council for the City and further enable efficient development of sites while achieving onsite amenity and maintain an appropriate and transparent standard of amenity for adjacent residents. Seeks to ensure that the standards across the relevant zones (GRZ, MRZ, HRZ, MUZ) are workable and provide for practical outcomes when actually implemented onsite. The submission requests amendments or the removal of standards which are overly onerous for residential development or which result in contradicting outcomes to other standards, therefore seeking a consistent approach within each Zone and across the Plan. Additionally, with respect to the High Density Residential Zone, the submission points seek amendments to the standards to allow for the optimal uptake of denser typologies to maximise use of this rezoned land for these purposes. The submitter notes concern regarding implementation by Councils Engineering Team of minimum floor levels above flood hazards across large areas of Napier and the implications this has on complying with height in relation to boundary standards. In some cases, sites are required to be raised 0.9m above existing ground level which compromises the ability to develop within a site, particularly for two-story dwellings. Notes that examples in parts of residential Christchurch which became susceptible to flooding were mapped within a Flood Management Area, and within these areas they are now exempt from complying with standard height in relation to boundary controls. Instead, the applicable recession planes within these areas are now determined as if the ground level at the relevant boundary was the minimum floor level set by the flood hazard (or natural ground level, whichever is higher).Considers this is an appropriate approach for Napier flood hazards as development of the site is not restricted by the requirement to raise the site	Amendment to the HRZ standards to allow for the optimal uptake of denser typologies to maximise use of this rezoned land for these purposes.  Seeks that standards across the relevant zones (GRZ, MRZ, HRZ, MUZ) are workable and provide for practical outcomes when actually implemented onsite. Seeks Amendments or the removal of standards which are overly onerous for residential development or which result in contradicting outcomes to other standards, therefore seeking a consistent approach within each Zone and across the Plan.	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Pip Beachen	142.32	Support	Supports a maximum height of 19.5m within the High Density Residential Zone.	Retain HRZ-S1.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary	Pip Beachen	142.33	Amend	Considers that the height in relation to boundary requirement too restrictive to allow for the efficient uptake of high density residential development constructed up to a height of 19.5m. the current recession planes push buildings of this height off the boundary considerably, therefore reducing the effective building area on a site. This is additionally exacerbated via the requirement to raise sites above flood levels applied by NCC. Requests that the height in relation to boundary line starts at the same level on the boundary as the minimum floor level applied to the site. Refers to implementation in the Christchurch District Plan. Refer to original submission for further detail. Considers that the Height in Relation to Boundary provision does not consider duplex dwellings or terraced houses on adjacent sites which are sought to be enabled in the objectives and policies for the zone.	Amend height in relation to boundary rules to be relaxed within the Medium Density Residential Zone to allow the efficient development of these sites. Seeks that consideration is given to conjoined duplex/terraced houses on separate lots whereby the height in relation to boundary standards are not required to be applied. Amend so that height in relation to boundary plane is taken from the minimum floor level at the relevant boundary.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S3: Front yards	Pip Beachen	142.34	Amend	Considers that the 1.5m setback is too onerous for apartment buildings which are better suited to be constructed up to a front boundary.	Amend so that the provisions consider a separate standard for apartment buildings whereby a front yard setback is not required.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S4: Other yards	Pip Beachen	142.35	Amend	Supports a setback distance of 1m from side and rear boundaries however no provision is made for duplex or terrace housing typologies.	Delete the requirement to comply with yard setbacks between attached dwellings across boundaries to give effect to Policy HRZ-P1	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S5: Building coverage	Pip Beachen	142.36	Amend	Opposes a building coverage of 50% for apartment style buildings. Considers that the standard as notified compromises the optimal uptake of land for residential purposes to maximise the yield anticipated by the zone.	Amended and increase standard to better reflect the anticipated building typologies for the zone.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S6: Impervious area	Pip Beachen	142.37	Support	Supports an impervious area of 80% for the High Density Residential Zone.	Retain HRZ-S6	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S8: Fences and wall	Pip Beachen	142.38	Support	Supports the retention of a fence and wall height of 2m within side and rear yards to provide for retaining and an adequate fence height above this retaining while still falling within the permitted fence height threshold, due to significant fill required to be placed in residential sites to achieve minimum floor levels above flood hazards.	Retain HRZ-S8.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S9: Garages and accessory buildings	Pip Beachen	142.39	Oppose	Opposes standard as notified as it has the potential to significantly restrict the ability to provide two-three level terraced houses facing the street, which may limit the viability of achieving this form. Also considers that the standard will produce generic outcomes providing for facades with no modulation. Design assessment criteria can address the relationship of dwellings to the street without requiring this restrictive control.	Delete HRZ-S9.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S10: Windows to the street	Pip Beachen	142.40	Amend	Opposes standard as it is currently worded. Considers that as street facing dwellings typically contain a garage (which can occupy up to 50% of a street facing façade), requiring 20% of glazing to then occupy the remaining portion of frontage would compromise the insulation and energy efficiency goals sought by the Building Code (noting that 40% of this area would require glazing). Notes appreciation for the requirement for passive surveillance and streetscape connectivity, however considers that the requirement for 20% glazing of the full façade is not appropriate in situations where there is a street facing garage. For multi-unit developments, the assessment criteria will apply in addition to the standard. Further flexibility is sought.	Amend the standard to only require 20% of the façade beyond any area occupied by a garage door to be in glazing.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S11: Outdoor living space	Pip Beachen	142.41	Oppose	Opposes the wording of HRZ-S11(3) and seeks further clarity around the interpretation of this standard.	Amend or delete HRZ-S11(3) as further clarity is required.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S12: Residential Outlook space	Pip Beachen	142.42	Oppose	Opposes the wording of the standard as notified for principle living spaces in that it requires an outlook which is more onerous than the outdoor living space requirement of 20m2.	Amend so that the outlook space for a principal living room is consistent of that with the outdoor living space.	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S13: Minimum residential unit size	Pip Beachen	142.43	Support	Supports the minimum residential unit size as notified.	Retain HRZ-S13.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S14: Maximum building length	Pip Beachen	142.44	Oppose	Opposes the standard in its current form and recommends that it needs to be rewritten to achieve a better outcome and avoid inefficient development on sites. Requiring a break in the building reduces the effective building area on a site.	Amend to remove the requirement for building separation and instead focus on architectural relief for 4m of the building to break up a continuous length or delete the standard and utilise assessment criteria to assess design matters.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /General	Pip Beachen	142.55	Support	Supports the standards of the General Residential Zone, Medium Density Residential Zone, and the High Density Residential Zone, except where otherwise stated through specific submission points. Considers that it is important that the standards appropriately facilitate the outcomes sought by Council for the City and further enable efficient development of sites while achieving onsite amenity and maintain an appropriate and transparent standard of amenity for adjacent residents. Seeks to ensure that the standards across the relevant zones (GRZ, MRZ, HRZ) are workable and provide for practical outcomes when actually implemented onsite.	Retain standards in the GRZ, MRZ and HRZ except where amendments are sought through separate submission points.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential /General	Shana Jessie Marie Cochrane	144.5	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including King Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential /General	William Nunes	145.5	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Ethel Kearns	146.1	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers these will impact the wellbeing of the community.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Ethel Kearns	146.2	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) particularly in the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers HRZ and MRZ will create a loss of nature, character, sunlight, privacy and community which will impact the wellbeing of residents.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O3: Quality living environments	Ethel Kearns	146.4	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential /	Catherine Hawkins	148.2	Amend	Concerns the increasing tendency for Council's to enable greater intensification of residential developments than anticipated by residents. Recent examples of higher density developments have demonstrated the parking, economic and social implications of these developments on the community. Residents should be entitled to have a say on any change to the character of their neighbourhood and so applications should be notifiable.	Amend provisions to make all these resource consent(s) applications <u>notifiable</u> so the community has an opportunity to have their say.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential /	Mark Witkowski Arna Witkowski	152.1	Oppose	Opposes the High Density Residential Zone in Carnell St, Napier South. Considers the lack of capacity for higher density on Carnell St. Considers the adverse effects to congestion. Also considers the negative effect on sunlight access. Expresses concern for the potential development of Kainga Ora housing with the enabling of six storey dwellings on Carnell St. Considers the adverse effects on surrounding schools. Considers the higher density would detract from the values of the heritage and art deco homes. Considers the negative impact on the financial value of existing homes in the proposed zones. Considers 6-storeys too high for Napier.	Seeks the removal of the proposed High Density Residential Zones considering the adverse social effects of six storey developments.	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Policies /HRZ-PS: Urban character	Mark Witkowski Arna Witkowski	152.2	Oppose	Opposes the High Density Residential Zone in Carnell St, Napier South.Considers the lack of capacity for higher density on Carnell St.Considers the adverse effects to congestion. Also considers the negative effect on sunlight access.Expresses concern for the development of Kainga Ora housing with the enabling of six storey dwellings on Carnell St. Considers the adverse effects on surrounding schools. Considers the higher density would detract from the values of the heritage and art deco homes. Considers the negative impact on the financial value of existing homes in the proposed zones. Considers 6-storeys too high for Napier.	Seeks the removal of the proposed High Density Residential Zones considering the adverse social effects of six storey developments	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Mark Witkowski Arna Witkowski	152.3	Oppose	Opposes the High Density Residential Zone in Carnell St, Napier South.Considers the lack of capacity for higher density on Carnell St.Considers the adverse effects to congestion. Also considers the negative effect on sunlight access.Expresses concern for the development of Kainga Ora housing with the enabling of six storey dwellings on Carnell St. Considers the adverse effects on surrounding schools. Considers the higher density would detract from the values of the heritage and art deco homes. Considers the negative impact on the financial value of existing homes in the proposed zones. Considers 6-storeys too high for Napier.	Seeks the removal of the proposed High Density Residential Zones considering the adverse social effects of six storey developments	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Issues /	- Angie Denby	154.1	Oppose	Oppose the HRZ (High Density Residential) zoning of Vigor Brown Street. The Graham Linwood Heritage Character report concludes the areas has significantly high level of character. High density development will impact character, block sunlight and privacy, and affect quality of living for residents. Creation of congestion issues; unreliable public transport.	Remove HRZ from Vigor Brown Street and rezone to General Residential. Extend Napier South Heritage Overlay to Vigor Brown St. Limit high density areas to those that already have it.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone	Amy Lee	156.1	Amend	Amend High Density Residential (HRZ) to exclude Nelson Crescent and the western side of Wellesley Road. Submitter purchased home because of its character and history and has spent time retaining these. Due to the nature of buildings on Nelson Crescent it is unsuitable for HRZ and should be protected as a heritage area, 2019 report by Graham Linwood supports this.	Seeks to delete Nelson Crescent and the western side of Wellesley Road from HRZ and retain them as "main residential" zones.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential /	Martin Wood	157.1	Oppose	Oppose the proposed rezoning of Vigor Brown Street and the surrounding neighbourhood to allow High Density housing, for the following reasons:  the expectation of peace, quiet, tranquillity, back gardens - qualities that will disappear if rezoned sealevel rising which could impact on low lying areas of Napier. Unwise to invest in infrastructure needed to support high density. patterns of work and business changing - no need to concentrate residential around the city centre anymore No requirement under NPS:UD to allow 6 storey buildings Insufficient public transport NCC poor record for managing large apartment blocks 2020 NCC work indicating high levels of character within the street	Remove HRZ from any existing suburbs of Napier. Rezone HRZ area on the area bounded by George's Drive, Kennedy Road, Jull and Carnell Streets to General Residential Zone. No High Density housing should be allowed in any existing suburbs of Napier, to avoid problems of shading and loss of privacy to existing residents.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential /	Jacqui Leake	158.1	Amend	Amend Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) and High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) to exclude Napier South, particularly HRZ between Jull Street and Georges Drive. Has concerns about impact on sunlight, noise, privacy, traffic, parking and preservation of character. Submitter suggests HRZ would be more suitable for Douglas Street and surrounding areas. Considers the public consultation process has been poorly executed and wants more consideration in the locations of MRZ and HRZ.	Seeks to retain the current residential settings in Napier South. The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	John Gillon	161.1	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers these will impact the wellbeing of the community.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission



# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	John Gillon	161.2	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) particularly in the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers HRZ and MRZ will create a loss of nature, character, sunlight, privacy and community which will impact the wellbeing of residents.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O3: Quality living environments	John Gillon	161.4	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential /General	Dorothy Brunei Kelsey	162.5	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) for the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Allan Thompson	163.2	Amend	Amend Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) on Elbourne Street. Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) on the opposite side of Elbourne Street. Has concerns about the zones impact on traffic, noise, their right to consultation, property damage, privacy, sunlight and character of the area.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Monique Charlotte Maria Van Groenewoud Raymond Mears	167.4	Oppose	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) particularly in the Taradale area including Elbourne Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community.	Relief Sought is not included, however it is inferred that the submitter seeks that the zoning for the Taradale area around Elbourne Street to revert to General Residential Zone (not HRZ or MRZ).	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S4: Other yards	Sheena McGuire	168.112	Amend	Notes that the HRZ Chapter does not contain a specific rail corridor building setback standard. Instead, the rail corridor boundary is assessed as a side or rear yard site boundary and a 1m building setback applies.Considers that setbacks are a common planning tool used to ensure the safe and efficient operation of activities such as the railway corridor, particularly when it may come into conflict with adjacent land uses. For rail, a setback provides a safe physical distance between a building and the railway corridor boundary. Heavy freight trains run on the railway lines through the Napier City District. Considers that without a sufficient setback, people painting their buildings, clearing gutters or doing works on their roof will need to access or foul the rail corridor. If a person or object encroaches onto the rail corridor, there is a substantial risk of injury or death for the person entering the rail corridor. Considers that a setback control has obvious safety benefits for the users of the land adjoining the rail corridor and users of the rail corridor. Also notes the efficiency benefits for rail operations, mitigating against the risk of train services being interrupted by unauthorised persons or objects entering the rail corridor. Considers that without appropriate setback requirements, there is significant risk of adverse health and safety effects impacting people locating and working in proximity to the railway corridor.Seeks a new clause within HRZ-S4: Other yards to require a 5m setback for structures and buildings from the rail corridor. Matters of discretion are also sought in the case that the setback cannot be achieved.	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>No part of any building may be erected closer than 1 m to a side or rear site boundary unless:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. written approval of the adjacent landowner(s) is provided, there is an existing common wall between two buildings on adjacent sites, or where a common wall is proposed, and</li> <li>b. any part of a building, fence or structure must not be erected closer than 6 m from the top of the bank of any watercourse or open drain.</li> </ol> <p><u>No part of any building or structure may be located within a 5m setback from a boundary shared with a rail corridor.</u></p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Purpose of the standard;</li> <li>2. Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces;</li> <li>3. Quality living environments;</li> <li>4. Operation and maintenance of watercourses and open drains;</li> <li>5. The safe and efficient operation of the rail network;</li> <li>6. <u>Compatibility with the surrounding environment; and</u></li> <li>7. The reason for the reduced setback.</li> </ol>	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Susan Elaine Macdonald	178.1	Amend	Considers that High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) should exclude Napier South and Marewa. 6 storey buildings would ruin the aesthetic of suburbs and have a detrimental effect on neighbouring properties. Has no issues with subdivisions along sections but has an issue with building up.Despite proposed upgrades of stormwater, submitter has concerns that stormwater run off from extra housing will overload stormwater infrastructure. Notes that 70% of Napier’s stormwater runs into Ahuriri Estuary, housing infill will increase this.Regarding proposed new regional park concept at blue lagoon farm that will provide treatment, what does this mean? The concept must be the last resort to preventing contaminates within the estuary. More work and funding need to be allocated to preventing contaminants reaching Lagoon Farm.Notes that consents for buildings in HRZ and MRZ do not need to be notified. Asks that all consents are notifiable It shouldn’t be the task of NCC to grant consent for High rise buildings without informing the neighbours. HRZ will have an impact on privacy and environment so everyone should have a say and be personally informed.Submitter supports the fencing rules for front facing fences. Wishes that fencing rules will apply to all new fences. This is due to submitters personal safety being deaf and a mobility user, cars cannot usually see them when pulling out. Fence rules will protect submitters safety.	Relief Sought is not included, however it is inferred that the submitter seeks that the proposal to rezone Napier South and Marewa HRZ be rejected.  It is also inferred that the submitter seeks that buildings within the HRZ be notifiable.  It is also inferred that the submitter seeks the approval of the proposal relating to front fences.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /HRZ-R1: Residential units and residential activity	Susan Elaine Macdonald	178.4	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) to exclude Napier South and Marewa. 6 storey buildings would ruin the aesthetic of suburbs and have a detrimental effect on neighbouring properties. Has no issues with subdivisions along sections but has an issue with building up.Despite proposed upgrades of stormwater, submitter has concerns that stormwater run-off from extra housing will overload stormwater infrastructure. Notes that 70% of Napier’s stormwater runs into Ahuriri Estuary, housing infill will increase this.Regarding proposed new regional park concept at lagoon farm that will provide treatment, what does this mean? The concept must be the last resort to preventing contaminates within the estuary. More work and funding need to be allocated to preventing contaminants reaching Lagoon Farm.Notes that consents for buildings in HRZ and MRZ do not need to be notified. Asks that all consents are notifiable It shouldn’t be the task of NCC to grant consent for High rise buildings without informing the neighbours. HRZ will have an impact on privacy and environment so everyone should have a say and be personally informed.Submitter supports the fencing rules for front facing fences. Wishes that fencing rules will apply to all new fences. This is due to submitters personal safety being deaf and a mobility user, cars cannot usually see them when pulling out. Fence rules will protect submitters safety.	Relief Sought is not included, however it is inferred that the submitter seeks the rejection of the proposal to rezone Napier South and Marewa HRZ.  It is also inferred that the submitter seeks that all buildings within the HRZ to be notifiable.  It is also inferred that the submitter seeks the inclusion of front fence rules as proposed.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S8: Fences and walls	Susan Elaine Macdonald	178.5	Support	Submitter supports the fencing rules for front facing fences. Wishes that fencing rules will apply to all new fences. This is due to submitters personal safety being deaf and a mobility user, cars cannot usually see them when pulling out. Fence rules will protect submitters safety.	Relief Sought is not included, however it is inferred that the submitter seeks that the proposal to rezone Napier South and Marewa HRZ be rejected.  It is also inferred that the submitter seeks that buildings within the HRZ be notifiable.  It is also inferred that the submitter seeks the approval of the proposal relating to front fences.	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O1: Housing supply and diversity	Ben Hasselman	181.3	Amend	Considers that there is an opportunity to become more actively involved in ensuring that housing stock meets the population needs, especially considering the requirements for the provision of housing that will accommodate people throughout every age and stage of their life. Currently there is a shortage of housing that can accommodate those with access needs and this will be intensified through allowing two- and three-story walk up residential builds, apartments and town housing being consented without the requirement for Universal Design or any reference to accessibility. While the PDP mentions providing a "range of housing types to meet the needs of our communities" neither this chapter nor the s 32 report refer to the accessibility / useability / Universal Design of the housing which is leaving a large gap in providing for the needs of our community.	Seeks to encourage Napier City Council to develop and adopt an amendment to the HRZ provision/s that will provide an incentive to designers and developers to increase the number of Universally Designed / Lifemark homes being built through the district. Lifemark can support Napier City Council with exploring options that would be beneficial for the community.  (The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Michael Tony Carson Narelle Vicky Carson	188.1	Amend	Amend High Density Residential (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential (MRZ) in Taradale, particularly Peddie Street. Considers social impacts, on both health and well-being of residents. Is concerned about impacts on noise, traffic, loss of green spaces, birdlife, character, sunlight, privacy, community, parking, anti-social behaviour, wind issues and the value of properties.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Michael Tony Carson Narelle Vicky Carson	188.2	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) particularly in the Taradale area including Peddie Street. Submitter has concerns of noise, privacy, parking, traffic, loss of nature, and a loss of community. Considers HRZ and MRZ will create a loss of nature, character, sunlight, privacy and community which will impact the wellbeing of residents.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /HRZ-R1: Residential units and residential activity	Angela McFlynn	189.49	Amend	Considers precluding public or limited notification for any development of a residential site to contain more than 1 residential unit is not appropriate. Significant increases in density have the potential to have significant adverse effects on the surrounding residential area, and residents have a right to have their concerns considered when there are potential direct effects on the use and enjoyment of their property. The Council, through the District Plan should show respect for their community and allow for public and / or limited notification where appropriate.	Amend HRZ-R1: Residential units and residential activity to:  Notification status: Any application under this rule is precluded from being notified on a public or limited basis, <u>only if compliance with all of standards HRZS1-HRZS14 is achieved.</u>	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.73	Amend	The current wording of this rule could be supported by amendments and/or a diagram to assist with implementation. i.e. a site plan review showing the area to which either clause (1) or (2) applies, then cross-sections demonstrating the required recession planes.	Amend wording and/or add diagrams to assist in understanding how to apply the standard.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential /	A Davidson	197.1	Oppose	Opposes High Density Residential (HRZ) in any Napier suburb. Allowing such developments will blemish the landscape, reduce property values impact the character of neighbourhoods, and create challenges for residents. HRZ creates environmental and social challenges. Provides Carnell Street as example of HRZ 'gone wrong' with increased, crime, violence and property damage. Causing elderly to have concerns about their safety. Submitter has concerns about HRZ impacting sunlight, privacy, noise, and crime. It is unfair to inflict HRZ on homeowners and rate payers and will create undesirable neighbourhoods. Also has concerns of carparking and ability to sustain traffic.	Seeks to amend plan and place HRZ out of city limits and not impact current neighbourhoods.  The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential /General	Scott Gould	199.2		Submitter wants to amend Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) and High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) as they are too broad and inconsiderate of Napier's character and its history. Many Art Deco homes are in proposed MRZ and HRZ.	Seeks to amend HRZ and MRZ to be restricted to very confined areas which can be incrementally expanded on in subsequent District Plan revisions.	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Darryl Furness	200.5	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) especially the zoning of Elbourne street, due to directly effecting the submitter. Is against the proposal as due its impact on the health and wellbeing of residents.Has concerns of increased noise, loss of character, increased traffic, parking, loss of trees and greenspace, sunlight, privacy, loss of community, increased anti-social behaviour, the capability of wastewater systems, and liquefaction risk.Also mentions the healthcare system and its ability to cope with an increased population.Height of buildings in HRZ will impact sunlight for residents affecting their health.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Policies /HRZ-P5: Urban character	warren pearce	206.2	Oppose	Opposes the introduction of medium and high density residential areas due to the downstream effects. Considers that the outdoor living space minimums are too low and would hard to development of children and the mental health of residents due to noise and privacy disturbances, and crime. Also considers the need for minimum parking requirements. Considers the negative impact of passive and active surveillance. Notes the loss of character in neighbourhoods and changing property values. (Refer to original submission for full reasons)	Inferred request to remove the proposed medium and high density chapters to protect private property rights.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /General	Georgina McPherson	215.123	Oppose	None of the objectives, policies or rules refer to reverse sensitivity effects. The Fuel Companies have two service stations which are either within or immediately adjacent to the HRZ and note that the activities provided for within this zone may be sensitive to the effects of these existing lawfully established activities.	<p>Add new objective and policy as follows:</p> <p><u>HRZ-OXX: Reverse sensitivity</u></p> <p><u>Existing non-residential activities are not unreasonably compromised by reverse sensitivity effects and/or incompatible activities in adjacent zones.</u></p> <p><u>HRZ-PXX: Reverse sensitivity</u></p> <p><u>Ensure that existing non-residential activities are not compromised by reverse sensitivity effects.</u></p> <p>Add new matters of discretion for rules HRZ-R1B, HRZ- R4B, HRZ-R6 and HRZ-R8 as follows:</p> <p>HRZ-R1B: Residential units and residential activity HRZ-R4B: Visitor accommodation</p> <p>HRZ-R6: Retirement village premises</p> <p>HRZ-R8: Activities infringing standards HRZ-S1 - HRZ- S14</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <p><u>... Reverse sensitivity effects on established adjacent land uses.</u></p>	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Policies /HRZ-P6: Non-residential activities	Georgina McPherson	215.124	Amend	The Fuel Companies are concerned that the direction in this policy applies to all non-residential activities, including existing lawfully established activities. They seek that this policy apply to new activities only.	<p>Amend HRZ-P6 as follows:</p> <p>Limit <u>new</u> non-residential activities in the zone to:</p> <p>a. prioritise ...</p>	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /General	Georgina McPherson	215.125	Oppose	The HRZ rules do not provide for existing service stations activities, including any alterations or additions to the existing activity. As a result, any alteration or addition to the existing activity is a non- complying activity in the zone under rule HRZ-R9 (activities not otherwise provided for). This is overly restrictive for existing activities. To address this, the Fuel Companies seek a new discretionary activity for service stations, subject to it being an addition, alteration or rebuild to that activity. In addition, a consequential change is needed to the definition of 'alteration or addition' as the current definition relates only to heritage buildings or structures (this is addressed earlier in this submission in the definitions section).	<p>Add new rule as follows:</p> <p><u>HRZ-RX: Service stations Activity status: Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>1.The activity is an addition, alteration or redevelopment of an existing service station.</u></p>	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Policies /HRZ-P3: Quality living environments - adjoining sites	Shravan Miryala	217.68	Amend	Considers that the amenity of more sensitive activities, such as residential activities, will be better protected where they have been appropriately designed to manage reverse sensitivity effects where there is an interface with lawfully established non-residential activities. Seeks relief consistent with design principle 1: The Site of the National medium density design guide (Ministry for the Environment, May 2022) which seeks that current or proposed nearby non-residential activities are identified and that residential development responds to them.	Amend HRZ-P3 as follows:  Mitigate the potential adverse effects of development on adjoining sites without limiting the ability to achieve the planned high-density residential built character, including by:  a. Setting buildings back from side and rear boundaries;  b. Limiting the length of buildings along side and rear boundaries;  c. Providing opportunities for sunlight access to neighbouring sites, <del>and</del>  d. For residential unit development involving four or more residential units, encouraging the use of design techniques such as building recesses, varied architectural treatment, and landscaping along side and rear boundaries., and  <u>e. managing reverse sensitivity at zone interfaces and the interface between commercial and noise-sensitive activities.</u>	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Policies /HRZ-P6: Non-residential activities	Shravan Miryala	217.69	Amend	Considers that the proposed wording in the policy does not consider existing lawfully established non-residential activities. If any changes or redevelopment is proposed, the wording in the MRZ-P6 will come into play as the activity will be assessed as a non-complying activity. Considers that this approach at the policy level is unnecessarily restrictive towards upgrades, changes to, additions and alterations to existing lawfully established non-residential activities. Seeks that the policy be more explicit and relate to the establishment of new activities.	Amend HRZ-P6 as follows:  MRZ-P6: Non-residential activities  Limit <u>new</u> non-residential activities in the zone to:  a. prioritise efficient use of the zone for residential activities;  b. minimise effects on the vitality of centre zones, and  c. minimise effects on residential amenity.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /General	Shravan Miryala	217.70	Oppose	Opposes as the "catch all other" Rule HRZ-R9 – Non-Complying does not appropriately provide for any existing "other" activities. Considers that changes, alterations, additions, upgrades and replacement of existing non-residential activities, particularly service stations, should not be non-complying activities, considering the suite of objectives and policies for this zone (and other residential zones). Considers the rules do not adequately provide for existing service stations activities, including any additions or alterations to the existing activity and as a result, any addition or alteration to the existing activity is a non-complying activity in the zone under rule HRZ-R9 (activities not otherwise provided for). Considers that this is overly restrictive with respect to existing activities, and the continued operation and development on the same site. Seeks that a new discretionary activity rule for service stations, is included in the PDP in all residential zones Noting that the built development on the site will, irrespective, be controlled by the Standards.	Add new rule as follows:  <u>HRZ-RX: Alterations, additions and redevelopment of existing service stations</u>  <u>Activity status: Discretionary</u>	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /HRZ-R9: Activities not otherwise provided for under Rules HRZ-R1 - HRZ-R8	Shravan Miryala	217.71	Oppose	Opposes as any changes to existing service stations will trigger a consent as a Non-Complying activity which is considered to be quite onerous given the activity has been lawfully established. Considers that Service Stations need to be identified as a separate activity with a Discretionary activity status where there will be scope for Council to assess the effects and also identify service stations as an activity especially in existing circumstances which is the case for existing Z Service Stations.	Insert new Rule  <u>HRZ-R9: Service Stations</u>  <u>Activity Status: Discretionary Activity.</u>  <u>This will require HRZ-R9 R10: Activities not otherwise provided for under Rules HRZ-R1 - HRZ-R8R9</u>	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S7: Landscaped area	Shravan Miryala	217.72	Amend	Supports that HRZ-S7(3) requires at least 50% of the area of the front yard must comprise landscaped area as it relates to the development of new residential buildings. However considers that any changes to existing service stations will have to consider this standard which is not currently achieved at the site identified above in the HRZ. Considers, it is unlikely to be achievable for a number of functional requirement reasons, including traffic safety. Opposes the imposition of this standard to existing service stations sites. Acknowledges that landscaping along the road boundary can enhance the attractiveness of a site and mitigate the effects of the development of the site. However considers that for service station sites, incorporating 50% of front yard landscaping into front boundary is problematic as service stations are served by large non-standard vehicle crossings which take up a significant length of the road frontage. Also considers that service stations have a significant number of traffic movements into and out of the site per day and where visibility to the forecourt and to signage is critical to a successful and safe operation, substantial trees, shrubs and plants can create a nuisance commercially and in terms of root extent and traffic safety.	Amend Standard HRZ-S7 to exclude existing service station sites from the landscaping requirements. This could be achieved by including the following additional exemption to the standard:  1. A residential unit at ground floor level must have a landscaped area of a minimum of 20% of a developed site with grass or plants, and can include the canopy of trees regardless of the ground treatment below them.  2. The landscaped area may be located on any part of the development site, and does not need to be associated with each residential unit.  3. At least 50% of the area of the front yard must comprise landscaped area.  <u>Except where:</u>  <u>a. the site is utilised by a lawfully established existing service station activity.</u>	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential /	Stu McLauchlan	218.1	Oppose	High Density developments have a dramatic effect on neighbouring properties in terms of privacy, light, parking and the value of properties, these effects need consideration. the council or developers should offer to buy out effected parties.	Seeks to include voluntary buy out requirement.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /HRZ-R5: Relocated buildings	Sean Thompson	225.4	Amend	Considers that it is not self-evident from the analysis and rationale in the proposed plan, including in terms of s 32 RMA, why relocated buildings should be classified as non-complying in the NCZ, LCZ, LFRZ, LIZ and GIZ. It is accepted that relocated buildings should be discretionary in the Natural Open Space Zone, and there may be urban design and other considerations applicable to the Town Centre Zone and City Centre Zone which warrant different treatment.  Since a 2004 Central Otago Environment Court decision most local authorities in New Zealand have either adopted permitted activity classification for relocated buildings (with no standards) or provided for permitted activity status with prescribed performance standards.	Seeks to amend the relocated buildings activity PDP Rules as follows:  a. Provide for relocated buildings as a permitted activity (like HRZ) in all relevant zones, excepting where a specified heritage or conservation or urban design consideration applies; b. For the relocated building rules in all zones, the removal of the requirement to deposit a monitoring fee at the same time as submitting the relocated building report; c. Amending the performance standards in relation to relocated buildings in accordance with the wording in the attached Schedule 1 (which can be found in the attached submission), to provide for: i. modification of the performance timeframes such that relocation on permanent foundation is required within two months, and twelve months is allowed for the completion of all reinstatement works; ii. provision for a pre-inspection report in the same or similar form as found in Schedule 2 (which can be found in the attached submission).  Consequential or further relief including to the relevant objectives, policies and provisions of the proposed plan in order to give effect to relief sought.  (The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Introduction	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.51	Amend	<p>Considers that the Ministry has an obligation to provide educational support and facilities for High Density Residential Zones (HRZ). While acknowledging that the purpose of HRZ is to provide for residential activities with a higher concentration of buildings, the ministry requests that amendments be made to the introduction to allow for social infrastructure such as educational facilities.</p>	<p>Seeks to make the following amendment:</p> <p>The purpose of the High Density Residential Zone is to provide predominantly for residential activities with a higher concentration and bulk of buildings than previously provided for and other compatible activities. This zone provides for urban residential living in the form of terrace housing and apartments. The zone is predominantly located around the city centre and Taradale town centre to support the highest levels of intensification in areas where this is appropriate.</p> <p>Enabling high-density residential development within a walkable catchment to the city centre (and other amenities where appropriate) provides for a greater range of housing choice within Napier city. It also provides opportunities for more people to walk or cycle to work and play in the city centre, which contributes to community and economic wellbeing.</p> <p>The High-Density Residential Zone provisions provide for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Achieving quality residential environments, including optimised connectivity, safe and attractive streetscapes and parks that encourage walking, cycling, and recreation, daylight access, privacy, and recognition of site context in design;</li> <li>· Enabling growth, including intensification close to the city</li> </ul>	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.52	Support	<p>Supports development and activities that contribute to safe, secure communities that provides for social wellbeing. The Ministry considers the establishment of any educational facilities within the HRZ to contribute to social well-being.</p>	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Policies /HRZ-P6: Non-residential activities	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.53	Amend	<p>Considers it is essential that educational facilities are enabled to support High Density Residential Zones (HRZ). Educational facilities, particularly early childhood centres and schools, need to be located within all residential zones to enable all members of the community to have adequate access to education.</p> <p>The Ministry typically use the NoR process for its school sites. In the Ministry's experience the objectives and policies of the zone are important provisions used to assess NoRs. Therefore, it is important to have strong objectives and policies that tell council and plan users that educational facilities are anticipated within the Zone.</p> <p>The Ministry request that an additional provision is included that enables non-residential activities (like educational facilities) if they support the community needs and wellbeing. This will allow the Ministry to provided schools for the community and better respond to growth over time.</p>	<p>Seeks to Amend to add an additional provision:</p> <p>activities</p> <p>Limit Non-residential activities in the zone to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. prioritise efficient use of the zone for residential activities;</li> <li>b. minimise effects on the vitality of centre zones, and</li> <li>c. minimise effects on residential amenity</li> </ol> <p><u>only those required to support well-functioning urban environments.</u></p>	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /General	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.54	Amend	<p>Considers Rule HRZ-R9 states that activities not otherwise provided for under rules HRZ-R1 – HRZ-R8 are non-complying. Any non-residential activities including educational facilities that fall under this rule would be non-complying. Educational facilities are not provided for and would therefore be a non-complying activity. The Ministry does not support this.</p> <p>Requests that educational facilities are provided for and enabled in the HRZ to serve the educational needs of the residential community and recommend a restricted discretionary activity status. The Ministry acknowledges that educational facilities can have effects on the surrounding environment, but these can be managed through appropriate matters of discretion. The Ministry proposes the following matters of discretion to restrict council's assessment to relevant effects.</p> <p>The matters of discretion we have proposed have been taken from other chapters in the Plan. However, if council does not support these, the Ministry would appreciate the opportunity to work with council to finalise this provision and come to an agreement on these matters of discretion.</p>	<p>Seeks to Amend HRZ to add the following provision:</p> <p><u>HRZ-RX</u></p> <p><u>Educational Facility</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Scale, design, layout, setbacks and screening;</u></li> <li>2. <u>Contribution to local community wellbeing;</u></li> <li>3. <u>Effects on the streetscape and neighbourhood character;</u></li> </ol>	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential /General	Pauline Sutton	236.1	Oppose	Opposes high density residential zone provisions. Considers the negative impact to house value and access to capital. Considers the risk of loss of privacy, sunlight access and increased noise in intensified areas.	No specific relief stated. Relief inferred to delete Medium Density Residential Provisions	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Pauline Sutton	236.2	Oppose	Opposes high density residential zone height provisions. Considers the risk of loss of privacy, sunlight access and increased noise in intensified areas.	No specific relief stated. Relief inferred to delete Medium Density Residential Provisions	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O3: Quality living environments	Pauline Sutton	236.3	Oppose	Opposes high density residential zone provisions. Considers the negative impact to house value and access to capital. Considers the risk of loss of privacy, sunlight access and increased noise in intensified areas.	No specific relief stated. Relief inferred to delete Medium Density Residential Provisions	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential /General	Murray and Elly Buchanan	237.2	Oppose	Opposes the introduction of medium and high density residential zones. Notes that with the change of government the Acts are being repealed while the NPS, if not also withdrawn, the inclusion of medium and high density zones to satisfy the requirements of the National Policy Statement is to be made voluntary for Councils to adopt.	Delete all the medium and high density residential provisions and replace with the existing residential zones.	Open Submission



# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential /General	Damien Shalfoon	239.2	Amend	<p>Amend The Napier South Historic Overlay (NSHO) it should include part of Vigor Brown Street (from the corner of Carnell Street to 48-51 Vigor Brown Street). Fencing restrictions for NSHO should be the same as the General Residential Zone (GRZ). High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) should be amended to exclude Vigor Brown area and the entire area within Georges Drive, Kennedy Road, Carnell Street and Jull Street.</p> <p>Napier South in an area with characterful attributes, which is a reason why buyers and tourists are drawn to the area.</p> <p>The Heritage Review found that McDonald Street and Vigor Brown Street contain a very high percentage of properties that reflect the forgoing description. Accordingly, both streets should be protected by a Heritage overlay and evenly retained as a General Residential Zone.</p> <p>Aesthetics and character of the area that has been preserved, represent the heritage and legacy of successive generations.</p> <p>Submitter can find no requirement for environments like Napier to have HRZ. Other larger cities do not reflect Napier's situation.</p> <p>It seems contradictory for apartment buildings that are out of scale to even be contemplated.</p> <p>Such buildings would dominate existing neighbourhoods. Further, if not unsightly, such developments without provision for onsite parking, sympathetic landscaping, effective storm water management, proper erosion</p>	<p>Seeks the inclusions of the Vigor Brown Street from the corner of Carnell Street to 48-51 Vigor Brown Street in the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay, and its exclusion from the HRZ.</p> <p>Seeks the same fencing restrictions as those within GRZ.</p>	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /General	Angela Jones	240.19	Amend	<p>Considers it necessary for similar protections be provided to those in the Subdivision chapter (SUB-O3) insofar as it recognises the need for development to protect the operation and access to established and planned network utilities and regionally significant infrastructure.</p>	<p>Include a new objective: <u>HRZ-Ox: Infrastructure provision</u></p> <p><u>Development protects the operation and access to established and planned network utilities and regionally significant infrastructure while mitigating reverse sensitivity effects.</u></p>	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Policies /General	Angela Jones	240.20	Amend	<p>Considers it necessary for similar protections be provided to those in the Subdivision chapter (SUB-P9) insofar as it recognises the need for development to protect the operation and access to established and planned network utilities and regionally significant infrastructure.</p>	<p>Include a new policy: <u>HRZ-Px: Integrated provision of infrastructure</u></p> <p><u>Require development to provide servicing that is coordinated, integrated, and compatible with the existing and planned infrastructure network.</u></p>	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	John Prucher	244.2	Amend	<p>Amend Medium Density Residential (MRZ) and High Density Residential (HRZ) housing zones to exclude Taradale. Submitter states personal freedoms are diminished through such housing zones and social cohesion is not existent impacting health of residents. Lack of outdoor space is detrimental especially to those with children. Taradale as it is has character and social cohesion, MRZ and HRZ will destroy this.</p>	<p>Seeks to delete MRZ and HRZ from the plan.</p> <p>Seeks to amend that plan to include more retirement villages.</p>	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Gary Jack French	251.2	Amend	<p>Amend High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) to exclude Carnell Street. Finds it ironic that HRZ will be in Carnell Street while also imposing Category B Built Heritage upon houses 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 &amp; 14 Carnell Street. the heritage value of the street will be compromised.</p> <p>Suspects the granting of Heritage status is a mechanism to soften HRZ. Granting of Category B Built Heritage status imposes limitations and costs to property owners. NCC Cannot have both Heritage housing adjacent to HRZ.</p> <p>Building up rather than out needs to be controlled and done aesthetically. With public input during the RMA process on the basis that existing civil services have capacity to handle greater demands HRZ will impose.</p> <p>The development of HRZ in Carnell Street will have the following detrimental impacts on the environment and current residents, devalue the heritage value of numbers 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 &amp; 14 in Carnell Street, create more shade, sunlight, privacy, noise, parking, visual look of homes, law and order, and health and safety risk for students.</p>	Inferred Relief Sought - Carnell Street be removed from HRZ.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Gary Jack French	251.4	Amend	<p>Amend High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) to exclude Carnell Street. Finds it ironic that HRZ will be in Carnell Street while also imposing Category B Built Heritage upon houses 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 &amp; 14 Carnell Street. the heritage value of the street will be compromised.</p> <p>Suspects the granting of Heritage status is a mechanism to soften HRZ. Granting of Category B Built Heritage status imposes limitations and costs to property owners. NCC Cannot have both Heritage housing adjacent to HRZ.</p> <p>Building up rather than out needs to be controlled and done aesthetically. With public input during the RMA process on the basis that existing civil services have capacity to handle greater demands HRZ will impose.</p> <p>The development of HRZ in Carnell Street will have the following detrimental impacts on the environment and current residents, devalue the heritage value of numbers 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 &amp; 14 in Carnell Street, create more shade, sunlight, privacy, noise, parking, visual look of homes, law and order, and health and safety risk for students.</p>	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Gary Jack French	251.5	Amend	<p>Amend High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) to exclude Carnell Street. Finds it ironic that HRZ will be in Carnell Street while also imposing Category B Built Heritage upon houses 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 &amp; 14 Carnell Street. the heritage value of the street will be compromised.</p> <p>Suspects the granting of Heritage status is a mechanism to soften HRZ. Granting of Category B Built Heritage status imposes limitations and costs to property owners. NCC Cannot have both Heritage housing adjacent to HRZ.</p> <p>Building up rather than out needs to be controlled and done aesthetically. With public input during the RMA process on the basis that existing civil services have capacity to handle greater demands HRZ will impose.</p> <p>The development of HRZ in Carnell Street will have the following detrimental impacts on the environment and current residents, devalue the heritage value of numbers 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 &amp; 14 in Carnell Street, create more shade, sunlight, privacy, noise, parking, visual look of homes, law and order, and health and safety risk for students.</p>	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Sandra Hagan	252.1	Oppose	<p>Opposes High Density Residential Zones (HRZ), these plans need to be put on hold. People of the city need more understandable information and better advised meeting times. These plans will not aid human freedom, happiness or health but will restrict people. Homeowners will lose the right to object high dwellings. which will impact valuations, privacy, noise, safety, mental health, and sunlight. HRZ will create slum areas. Families need gardens. HRZ will create more earthquake and flooding risk. young people need outdoor space.</p>	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Kahori and Glenn Nakagawa and Munroe	254.1	Amend	<p>Considers being surrounded by heritage style pre-1930s earthquake houses on large sections. Submitter was under the impression that their area would be zoned as a heritage area which required them to maintain the style of their house, submitter has since invested in two extensions in keeping to the style of their house and would like explanation on what happened to the plan. States the street will not support any additional road parking for any complexes or apartment buildings as the majority of it is already full. Considers apartments will bring down the style of their area and bring down house values. Concerns of impact on privacy and shade noise and safety. Is also concerned about wastewater coping with housing.</p>	Seeks discarding the proposed plan on the zone changes for Vigor Brown Street (between Carnell and Kennedy Road).	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Geoff Mitford - Taylor	258.1	Oppose	<p>Opposes High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) as it would have adverse effects on many areas - specifically Napier South and Kennedy Road - (South to Riverbend).</p>	<p>Relief Sought is not included.</p> <p>Seeks to remove Napier South and Kennedy Road from HRZ - [Inferred Relief Sought]</p>	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary	Geoff Mitford - Taylor	258.2	Oppose	<p>Opposes High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) as it would have adverse effects on many areas - specifically Napier South and Kennedy Road - (South to Riverbend).</p>	<p>Relief Sought is not included.</p> <p>Seeks to remove Napier South and Kennedy Road from HRZ - [Inferred Relief Sought]</p>	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S3: Front yards	Geoff Mitford - Taylor	258.3	Oppose	<p>Opposes High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) as it would have adverse effects on many areas - specifically Napier South and Kennedy Road - (South to Riverbend).</p>	<p>Relief Sought is not included.</p> <p>Seeks to remove Napier South and Kennedy Road from HRZ - [Inferred Relief Sought]</p>	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S8: Fences and walls	Geoff Mitford - Taylor	258.4	Oppose	<p>Opposes High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) as it would have adverse effects on many areas - specifically Napier South and Kennedy Road - (South to Riverbend).</p>	<p>Relief Sought is not included.</p> <p>Seeks to remove Napier South and Kennedy Road from HRZ - [Inferred Relief Sought]</p>	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Virginia Mitford - Taylor	259.1	Amend	<p>Amend High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) as it would have adverse effects on submitters property (24A McDonald Street). More of the Historic Overlay houses should be protected, Jull, Vigor Brown and the rest of McDonald should be zoned and historic.</p>	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary	Virginia Mitford - Taylor	259.2	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) as it would have adverse effects on submitters property (24A McDonald Street). More of the Historic Overlay houses should be protected, Jull, Vigor Brown and the rest of McDonald should be zoned and historic.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S3: Front yards	Virginia Mitford - Taylor	259.3	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) as it would have adverse effects on submitters property (24A McDonald Street). More of the Historic Overlay houses should be protected, Jull, Vigor Brown and the rest of McDonald should be zoned and historic.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S8: Fences and walls	Virginia Mitford - Taylor	259.4	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) as it would have adverse effects on submitters property (24A McDonald Street). More of the Historic Overlay houses should be protected, Jull, Vigor Brown and the rest of McDonald should be zoned and historic.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /General	Judith Mary Robinson	260.15	Amend	<p>Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ)as they include Peddie Street, King Street and Elbourne Street. Specifically opposes listed provisions.</p> <p>The plan does not consider the wellbeing of existing residents. Submitters concerns are, sunlight deprivation, water/stormwater drainage, privacy, ensuring greenspace, considering needs of ageing residents, and traffic. Suggests to only build on the northside of Elbourne/Peddie Street and to start apartment development of Taradale shopping centre. New fences and surfaces should be heat absorbing. Buildings should be staggered to get sun. Lower percentage of impervious surfaces and the Ngaruroro stop bank will need raising. Suggests fewer concrete drives with wood surfaces under limestone.</p> <p>What is "one residential unit" (e.g. in MRZ-R1) please?</p> <p>What is the distance that constitutes a 'neighbour' please?</p>	<p>Seeks to have further consultation on the locations that are suitable for development.</p> <p>Seeks to have an opportunity to expand their ideas.</p> <p>Seeks further development of water drainage/stormwater drainage.</p> <p>Seeks to ensure developments take measures to mitigate climate change.</p> <p>Seeks to have sunlight corridors.</p> <p>Seeks to amend permitted heights.</p> <p>Seeks to have noise issues addressed.</p> <p>The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission.</p>	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O3: Quality living environments	Vivienne Fraser	265.1	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan and high and medium density zones. Notes that growth is estimated at 0.6 - 0.8%. Considers that all of the proposals need to be halted or drastically amended to retain the basic rights and needs of every person, and that the plan removes basic and core rights. Considers that there is a lack of supportive infrastructure for increased population density. Considers there is a greater risk of flooding due to larger catchment area and inadequate infrastructure. Notes that previous flood incidents highlight the need for infrastructure upgrades. Considers removal of trees and grass contradicts efforts to reduce carbon emissions. Considers that the basic rights impacted by high-density housing including consent of homeowners regarding adjacent property development, preservation of property value and avoidance of negative impacts on resale, rights to personal space, privacy, quietness, and unobstructed sunlight, preservation of peaceful and restful living conditions, including noise level considerations. and ensuring adequate space for children to play and feel safe. Notes the reasons to limit or reduce medium and high-density housing including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- High concentrations of people can lead to social issues such as crime and hopelessness.</li> <li>- Concerns about mental health, wellbeing, anxiety, and safety in densely populated areas.</li> <li>- Lack of sunlight affects both residents and gardens, impacting health.</li> <li>- Decreased land value can lead to feelings of entrapment and decreased mobility.</li> <li>- Noise pollution and safety concerns contribute to declining neighborhood quality.</li> <li>- Impact on city aesthetics, tourism, and overall appeal.</li> </ul>	<p>Seeks a halt to plan in Napier/Hastings like Christchurch, more public consultation and public meetings, transparency, and retention of earthquake regulations, while imposing restrictions on building height in residential zones. Refer to original submissions for full details</p>	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential /General	David Chan	268.2	Oppose	<p>Considers that Council's interpretation of the requirements of the NPS:UD in its rezoning of large parts of Napier South, Marewa and Taradale has been misconstrued and misapplied. There is no requirement in the NPS:UD for Tier 2 urban environments (such as Napier) to have High Density Residential Zones with six-storey apartments, because smaller urban centres are not as built-up as larger cities and do not have large public transport systems. The NPS:UD considered it inappropriate to impose High Density housing on smaller urban environments, and there is no justification for the Napier Council to do so. High Density housing should not be permitted in the Vigor Brown Area. Even one six-storey apartment, let alone many such apartments, would destroy the character and ambience of the Area and would dominate the streetscape. If the Vigor Brown Area were given a Heritage Overlay, it would be excluded from the High Density Residential Zone. However, of itself, that would not provide sufficient protection for the heritage character of the Vigor Brown Area or the part of McDonald Street that has a proposed Heritage Overlay. For example, if six-storey apartments were built on Georges Drive or Jull Street, they would overshadow and diminish the heritage character of Vigor Brown Street and McDonald Street. Accordingly, it is necessary to exclude High Density housing from the area surrounding the Vigor Brown Area and McDonald Street. We submit that the entire area within Georges Drive, Kennedy Road, Carnell Street, and Jull Street, should be a General Residential Zone. This will enhance the protection of the Heritage Overlay areas.</p> <p>Some of the effects of a High density residential zone for this area include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>significant loss of amenity</li> <li>significant loss of access to sunlight</li> </ul>	<p>No relief sought however it is inferred the relief sought from the submission is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- extend the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay to include Vigor Brown Street (both sides of the street) from Carnell Street to 48-51 Vigor Brown Street (the Vigor Brown area).</li> <li>- Rezone the Vigor Brown area from High Density Residential to General Residential.</li> <li>- Rezone the entire area within Georges Drive, Kennedy Road, Carnell Street, and Jull Street (see Attachment 3 of full submission), to General Residential Zone.</li> <li>- Fence rules for the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay should be the same as those for the General Residential Zone</li> </ul>	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential /General	Lindsay Manning David Chan	269.2	Oppose	<p>Considers that the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay needs to be extended to include all of Vigor Brown Street and McDonald Street between Carnell Street and Latham Street, and the High Density Residential Zone to exclude the entire area between Georges Drive, Carnell Street (both sides), Jull Street (both sides), and Nelson Crescent (both sides), rezoning this to General Residential for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Graham Linwood Heritage Character Report provides evidence of the areas heritage values and concludes that the both McDonald Street and Vigor Brown Street have high levels of authentic character;</li> <li>there is no difference in heritage character between the section of McDonald Street that is to be protected and the rest of the street and Vigor Brown Street;</li> <li>submitter was drawn to live in Napier South because of its heritage character;</li> <li>submitter has worked hard to renovate and maintain the property to preserve its heritage values;</li> <li>one modern high-rise apartment building (let alone many) would significantly impact on the heritage character values of the street;</li> <li>the policy direction set by the NPS:UD has been misconstrued and misapplied allowing high and/or medium density development in the area would result in loss of amenity, and transport and social cohesion issues</li> </ul>	<p>Seeks the High Density Residential Zone in Napier South to exclude the entire area between Georges Drive, Carnell Street (both sides), Jull Street (both sides), and Nelson Crescent (both sides). This area should be General Residential.</p>	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential /General	Margie Clayton	270.1	Amend	<p>Amend High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) to exclude McDonald Street and surrounding areas. Submitter brought their property with intentions of it being a forever home for them and their son, they have worked at maintaining the houses special character. Thinks the house and surrounding areas would be classified as special character homes and that this would protect those homes from HRZ. HRZ will impact sunlight, privacy, shade, and parking negatively.</p>	<p>Seeks to maintain McDonald Street, Vigor Brown Street and surrounding areas zone as general residential zones. Seeks to amend HRZ to remove McDonald Street, Vigor Brown Street and surrounding areas.</p>	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Dominic McClarey	275.1	Oppose	<p>Objects to 19.5m high apartment blocks being built in Taradale.</p>	<p>Relief Sought is not included.</p>	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Policies /HRZ-P4: Quality living environments - within the site	Dominic McClarey	275.3	Oppose	Objects to 12m and 19m High apartment blocks in Taradale, and commercial buildings in Taradale as this will result in a negative impact on character, privacy and sunlight access, an increase in traffic movements, and a reduction in the value of the submitters property. Objects to there being no car parking requirement and an increase in noise allowance. Objects to shoe-horning of development where there is old infrastructure, and a loss of green corridors.	Relief Sought not included, however it is inferred that the submitter objects to the medium and high density residential zoning proposed in Taradale.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Dominic McClarey	275.4	Oppose	Objects increased vehicle movement.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O4: Neighbourhood character and identity	Dominic McClarey	275.6	Oppose	Objects reduction in privacy and sunlight.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S3: Front yards	Dominic McClarey	275.7	Oppose	Opposes 19.5m and 12m high apartment blocks in Taradale and commercial buildings. HRZ impacts, parking, privacy, sunlight, vehicle movement, noise, neighbourhood character, traffic congestion, and green corridors. There will be a loss of value in submitters investment in Peddie Street.  Objects Loss of green corridors in road reserves and on properties with a proposed 1.5m setback.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S1: Height	Bruce Cameron Morrin	276.2	Amend	Amend to exclude Nelson Crescent and the western side of Wellesley Road from being a (HRZ) High Density Residential Zone. Suggests the Street should be classified as a heritage area to protect its character. Suggests area is unsuited for six storey high buildings. Submitter indicates that such planning in other areas in the past has causes damage to the value and enjoyment of properties due to shadowing, value and privacy impacts, and suggests Napier incur these same issues. The current development on Wellesley Road is an example of bad planning and has de-valued the area.	Seeks to remove Nelson Crescent and the western side of Wellesley Road from HRZ. Reduce building height in this area (Inferred).  The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S8: Fences and walls	Bruce Cameron Morrin	276.3	Oppose	Opposes fence heights being limited to 1.2m high. Believes that proposal will not reduce crime. However, will reduce privacy. A better solution will be higher fences and cameras. Fence heights should be a decision for property owners.	Seeks to retain current fence heights.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O1: Housing supply and diversity	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.116	Support	Supports land for high density urban living that is in close proximity and has good access to public transport or multi modal access to commercial activities, public open spaces and community services.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.117	Amend	Considers that housing should be appropriately designed and insulated to mitigate noise effects from the existing environment in the interests of the human health of occupants.	Amend to include  <u>Where developments are located in proximity to legally established activities that emit noise (such as State Highways), they are designed to mitigate noise and vibration effects on sensitive receivers.</u>	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /HRZ-R6: Retirement village premises	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.118	Amend	Supports in part R6 as the matters of discretion include: Infrastructure capacity and stormwater management, however, considers it should be amended to include the safety and efficiency of the transport network	Amend to include <u>Infrastructure capacity including the safety and efficiency of the transport network.</u>	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /General	Kainga Ora - Brendon Liggett	285.3	Oppose	Opposes the use of the word 'maintain and enhance' within the purpose statements in the respective 'Standards Tables' of the GRZ, MRZ and HRZ.	Amend to refer to the 'planned built environment' in line with the objectives and policies of each zone and Policy 6 of the NPS-UD. The consequential requirement for development to 'maintain and enhance' the existing character of an area conflicts with the overall direction of the PDP to enable growth and intensification.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /HRZ-R1: Residential units and residential activity	Kainga Ora - Brendon Liggett	285.7	Amend	Seeks that the permitted number of dwellings be increased as follows:(a) HRZ-R1A – Increase the number of dwellings permitted on site from 1 to 3 dwellings.	Increase the number of dwellings permitted on site from 1 to 3 dwellings.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S14: Maximum building length	Kainga Ora - Brendon Liggett	285.9	Oppose	Opposes MRZ-S14 and HRZ-S14 and seeks that these maximum building length standards of 22m are deleted. Considers that the purpose of this standard is to manage visual dominance; however, this is already appropriately managed by maximum heights, height in relation to boundary and yard setback standards.	Delete maximum building length standards of 22m	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Assessment criteria /HRZ-AC1: Residential units (HRZ-R1); Relocated buildings (HRZ-R5); Retirement village premises (HRZ-R6)	Kainga Ora - Brendon Liggett	285.12	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the District Plan and seeks that reference to these are deleted. Considers that these act as de-facto rules to be complied with. Opposes any policy or rule approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Considers that Design Guidelines should be treated as a non- statutory tool and should sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. Seeks that any specific design guideline be relocated within a specific rule, matter of discretion or assessment criterion. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment. Notes that reference to design guidance that is regulated by another Council removes the ability for Council to adapt the guidance to reflect best practice and the planned built environment for the local urban environment of Napier City.	Delete reference to Design Guidelines in the District Plan	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Rules Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.61	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency requires the ability to construct and operate emergency service facilities (i.e., fire stations) in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies. This means new fire stations may be necessary in any zone across the district in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the effects of a fire station can be largely anticipated and, in the most part, do not differ to the effects of many activities that may be anticipated through rural and urban environments.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency requests that emergency service facilities are provided for as permitted activities in the larger, more extensive zones of the district to recognise the critical importance of emergency services to communities. In providing for emergency service facility as a permitted activity would mean that emergency service facilities would be controlled by the subsequent performance standards of each zone (such as height, height in relation to boundary, front yards, building coverage requirements).and the other relevant performance standards in other chapters (i.e., transport) to ensure that any effects are appropriately managed.</p>	<p>Seeks to include new permitted activity as follows:</p> <p><u>xxx-Rx: Emergency service facilities</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status: Permitted</u></p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.</p>	Open Submission

# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.80	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency's main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</p> <p>SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.</p> <p>In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and</p>	<p>Seeks to include a new performance standard as follows:</p> <p><u>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</u></p> <p><u>1. All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u></p> <p><u>2. Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p><u>Matter of discretion:</u></p> <p><u>1. The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p>	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O2: Community wellbeing	Alec Duncan	288.119	Support	Supports this objective as it seeks development and activities that contribute to the safety of communities. This would include emergency service facilities.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Objectives /HRZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Alec Duncan	288.120	Support	Supports HRZ-O5 insofar that it requires public health and environmental wellbeing be maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure. This would include firefighting water supply and access for Fire and Emergency operations.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /Policies /HRZ-P7: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Alec Duncan	288.121	Support	Supports HRZ-P7 insofar that it seeks to ensure sufficient infrastructure provision and/or mitigation measures to accommodate demand. This would include firefighting water supply and access for Fire and Emergency operations.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S3: Front yards	Alec Duncan	288.122	Amend	Seeks the inclusion of a new matter of discretion to provide NCC the ability to consider the risk of non-compliance with HRZ-S3 on emergency service access. It is important that emergency service access suitable for Fire and Emergency personnel is provided at site boundaries, as well as provision for emergency egress by residents.	<p>Add a new matter of discretion as follows:</p> <p><u>x. The ability for emergency services to safely and efficient access the site.</u></p>	Open Submission
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S4: Other yards	Alec Duncan	288.123	Amend	seeks the inclusion of a new matter of discretion to provide NCC the ability to consider the risk of non-compliance with HRZ-S4 on emergency service access. It is important that emergency service access suitable for Fire and Emergency personnel is provided at site boundaries, as well as provision for emergency egress by residents.	<p>Add a new matter of discretion as follows:</p> <p><u>x. The ability for emergency services to safely and efficient access the site.</u></p>	Open Submission



# HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HRZ - High Density Residential Zone /HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table /HRZ-S14: Maximum building length	Alec Duncan	288.124	Amend	Concern expressed relating to long narrow driveways for a number of dwelling units, and the delays and other negative impacts this can cause. A 1m side boundary could cause an impediment to personnel accessing and people evacuating the building. Multiple dwelling units along a narrow section could also result in non-affected units being trapped during the time of the emergency. Supports the 4m gap between 22m long buildings, but seeks to have the 4m gap also applying to side boundaries, reducing delays and conflicts during an emergencies.	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>1. The maximum length of a building above ground floor level shall be 22 m, measured parallel to side and rear boundaries,after which there shall be a minimum separation of 4 m between any other building on the same site <u>and the side boundary of which the main pedestrian access route to the residential units are provided.</u></p> <p>Add a new matter of discretion as follows:</p> <p><u>4. The ability for emergency services to safely and efficient access the site.</u></p>	Open Submission

# PREC1 - Harbour Reserve Amenity Precinct

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PREC1 - Harbour Reserve Amenity Precinct /PREC1 - Harbour Reserve Amenity Precinct - Standards Table	Susan Dallas	25.5	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
PREC1 - Harbour Reserve Amenity Precinct /PREC1 - Harbour Reserve Amenity Precinct - Standards Table	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.5	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission

# PREC2 - Mission Residential Precinct

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PREC2 - Mission Residential Precinct /PREC2 - Mission Residential Precinct - Rules Table /PREC2-R2: Residential activities within 'prominent visual development area' as identified on the Structure Plan	Cameron Drury	128.3	Oppose	It will take some time for vegetation (yet to be planted) to mature to a level whereby the requirements of the rule can be met, therefore the timing does not work for a controlled activity status condition. Planting of the Eastern Hill face will provide softening/screening in any case, Future landowners within the 'prominent visual development area' will not own the planting below, thus will have no ability to influence maintenance to achieve compliance with this activity condition, The level of regulation is not necessary to achieve Structure Plan outcomes, There is no specific Policy support for this rule.	Delete rule.	Open Submission
PREC2 - Mission Residential Precinct /PREC2 - Mission Residential Precinct - Rules Table /PREC2-R3: Subdivision	Cameron Drury	128.4	Amend	Subdivision in accordance with the activity standards is enabled and anticipated by the zone and therefore should be exempt from any notification requirements.	Amend PREC2-R3A to preclude public and limited notification.	Open Submission
PREC2 - Mission Residential Precinct /PREC2 - Mission Residential Precinct - Rules Table /PREC2-R3: Subdivision	Cameron Drury	128.5	Amend	RMS230018 provides for the construction of a secondary entrance but the timing of construction is deferred until Council undertakes its realignment of Puketitiri Road. This is no longer a matter to be included as a condition of a rule.	Delete activity condition (2).	Open Submission
PREC2 - Mission Residential Precinct /PREC2 - Mission Residential Precinct - Rules Table /PREC2-R5: Retirement village premises	Cameron Drury	128.6	Oppose	Unclear why Retirement Village Premises in the Precinct are not treated the same as the same activity in other residential areas, including the underlying zone.	Delete Rule and defer to General Residential Zone rules.	Open Submission
PREC2 - Mission Residential Precinct /PREC2 - Mission Residential Precinct - Standards Table /PREC2-S1: Density	Cameron Drury	128.17	Amend	There are a range of terms used throughout the precincts and the appendices. These should be consistent for ease of implementation.	Review reference to 'Indicative Urban Development Extent' as opposed to 'Mission Residential Precinct'.	Open Submission
PREC2 - Mission Residential Precinct /PREC2 - Mission Residential Precinct - Standards Table /PREC2-S3: Front yards	Cameron Drury	128.18	Oppose	A 5m setback is not necessary.	Amend to a consistent 3m setback requirement.	Open Submission
PREC2 - Mission Residential Precinct /PREC2 - Mission Residential Precinct - Standards Table /PREC2-S4: Neighbourhood centre - frontages	Cameron Drury	128.19	Oppose	A generic approach to a veranda may not result in the best outcome. Designing to a standard rather than to site specific requirements may result in unintended outcomes.	Delete (4) and consider as part of a resource consent application, which would be assessed as a Restricted Discretionary Activity in any case.	Open Submission
PREC2 - Mission Residential Precinct /Assessment criteria /PREC2-AC1: All subdivision and development	Cameron Drury	128.23	Amend	PREC2-AC1(a) - The outcomes referred to may not be in strict accordance with the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure.	Amend (a) to acknowledge this in a similar manner as currently noted in Design Outcome 5 of the PDP for the Development Area.	Open Submission
PREC2 - Mission Residential Precinct /Assessment criteria /PREC2-AC1: All subdivision and development	Cameron Drury	128.24	Amend	PREC2-AC1(c) - The outcomes referred to may not be in strict accordance with the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure.	Amend (c) to acknowledge this in a similar manner as currently noted in Design Outcome 6 of the PDP for the Development Area (final bullet point).	Open Submission
PREC2 - Mission Residential Precinct /Assessment criteria /PREC2-AC1: All subdivision and development	Cameron Drury	128.25	Amend	PREC2-AC1(n)-(q) - The wastewater system anticipated in the original Structure Plan is not feasible thus the assessment criteria is no longer applicable. Design Outcome 13 of the ODP as developed through the Plan Change process included a statement that water supply infrastructure is to be vested in Council. This direction should remain.	Amend or delete as necessary to accord to the low pressure system adopted for the Development Area. Amend (q) to give direction that wastewater infrastructure is to be vested in Council.	Open Submission
PREC2 - Mission Residential Precinct /Assessment criteria /PREC2-AC1: All subdivision and development	Cameron Drury	128.26	Amend	PREC2-AC1(s)-(t) - The water supply system anticipated in the original Structure Plan is not feasible thus the assessment criteria is not applicable. Design Outcome 14 of the ODP as developed through the Plan Change process included a statement that water supply infrastructure is to be vested in Council. This direction should remain.	1. Amend or delete as necessary to accord to the solution being adopted for the Development Area. 2. Amend (t) to give direction that water supply infrastructure is to be vested in Council.	Open Submission
PREC2 - Mission Residential Precinct /Assessment criteria /PREC2-AC1: All subdivision and development	Cameron Drury	128.27	Amend	PREC2-AC1(u) - Satisfying the requirements of 'good ground' under the New Zealand Building Code: NZBC B1/AS4 is not the only method of ensuring suitable foundation solutions.	Amend to enable 'alternative solutions' that achieve the same outcome as advised by a suitably qualified expert.	Open Submission
PREC2 - Mission Residential Precinct /Assessment criteria /PREC2-AC1: All subdivision and development	Cameron Drury	128.28	Amend	The General Residential Zone assessment criteria should only apply to landuse.	Remove reference to the assessment criteria of the General Residential Zone when assessing subdivision applications.	Open Submission

# PREC3 - Napier Hill Mataruahou Amenity Precinct

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PREC3 - Napier Hill Mataruahou Amenity Precinct /General /General	Phil Stickney	263.31	Oppose	The Submitter has a specific interest in a number of larger sites on Napier Hill which fall under the aforementioned GRZ Zone and PREC-3 provisions. These highly modified sites have historically been used for healthcare services with larger buildings constructed by the Government, including the former multi storey nurses' hostel which has only recently been demolished. This site in particular represents a significant opportunity, on a vacant site, for a comprehensive residential development however that is not enabled by the provisions of the GRZ, or the provisions associated with the PREC3 - Napier Hill / Mataruahou Amenity Precinct. Given their size and location they can offer an opportunity for an efficient use of larger sites for higher density residential development, visitor accommodation, residential care, and retirement uses.	Include narrative which recognises and provides for higher density development on specified sites within PREC 3, specifically:  a) 20A/B Hospital Terrace, b) 186 Battery Road, c) 79 Napier terrace, d) 102 Chaucer Road, e) 2 sixty fifth St and f) 2 Parade Street.	Open Submission
PREC3 - Napier Hill Mataruahou Amenity Precinct /Issues /General	Phil Stickney	263.33	Oppose	Amendment is sought to the Issues as they place the maintenance of character over and above the direction set by the NPS-UD 2020 and over which special character is not necessarily an overriding matter in all instances. The provisions need to be balanced to give effect to the direction of the NPS.	Amend the provisions to reflect the NPS-UD 2020 and the recognition of the larger sites that can accommodate a variety of higher density activities and additionally reference the underlying zonings sought in this submission.	Open Submission
PREC3 - Napier Hill Mataruahou Amenity Precinct /Objectives /PREC3-O2: Retention of amenity character values	Phil Stickney	263.34	Oppose	Opposes the terminology in PREC-O2 as it requires the retention of character values which has the effect of seeking to lock the existing character of the area up. That is not mandated by Policy 6 of the NPS-UD 2020 which signals changing amenity is to be expected as communities evolve and grow. This is also reflected in PREC3-P2.	Amend PREC-O3 to reflect the importance of "managing" special character rather than retention and any associated amendments to PREC3-P2.	Open Submission
PREC3 - Napier Hill Mataruahou Amenity Precinct /Policies /PREC3-P2: Character and amenity values	Phil Stickney	263.35	Oppose	Opposes the terminology in PREC-O2 as it requires the retention of character values which has the effect of seeking to lock the existing character of the area up. That is not mandated by Policy 6 of the NPS-UD 2020 which signals changing amenity is to be expected as communities evolve and grow. This is also reflected in PREC3-P2.	Amend PREC-O3 to reflect the importance of "managing" special character rather than retention and any associated amendments to PREC3-P2.	Open Submission
PREC3 - Napier Hill Mataruahou Amenity Precinct /Objectives /General	Phil Stickney	263.36	Oppose	Seeks the addition of a new Objective as PREC-O3 which recognises and provides for the consideration of larger scale comprehensively designed residential, visitor accommodation or residential care/retirement villages on the identified sites and limits larger scale development to those identified sites.	Add a new Objective to give effect to the relief sought in the submission which recognises the range of activities sought.	Open Submission
PREC3 - Napier Hill Mataruahou Amenity Precinct /PREC3 - Napier Hill/Mataruahou Precinct - Rules Table /General	Phil Stickney	263.37	Oppose	Seeks an addition to PREC 3-R1 to PREC-R4 to reflect the nature of the site-specific land use activities sought provisions sought and amend the rules for the GRZ/PREC3 Precinct accordingly. The Submitter considers that the activities can be addressed as Restricted Discretionary Activities subject to matters of discretion that can be tailored to reflect their context and setting and in doing so enable a thorough assessment of relevant matters while recognising that such development is envisaged for these sites.	Add new rules which provide for larger-scale activities as sought, allied to a suite of matters for assessment over which Council will utilise as Assessment Criteria.	Open Submission
PREC3 - Napier Hill Mataruahou Amenity Precinct /PREC3 - Napier Hill/Mataruahou Precinct - Standards Table /General	Phil Stickney	263.38	Oppose	Seeks an additional Standard which regulates the standards to be applied to the identified higher density sites and clarifies which of the underlying zone standards (as they relate to the amended zonings sought) will be amended by the standards in PREC3. This enables a balanced approach of enabling higher density development but with additional or amended tailored standards to manage the outcomes sought and the key effects to be addressed.	Add a new standard into PREC3 clarifying the underlying zoning standards which apply.	Open Submission
PREC3 - Napier Hill Mataruahou Amenity Precinct /Assessment criteria /General	Phil Stickney	263.39	Oppose	Amend assessment criteria in order to aid in usability and ease of use.	Redraft provisions to aid in clarity and focus on salient matters clearly.	Open Submission
PREC3 - Napier Hill Mataruahou Amenity Precinct /PREC3 - Napier Hill / Mataruahou Amenity Precinct /General	Alan Petersen	272.2	Amend	Considers that where carparking on a steep site is a constraining issue, or overly expensive to build, that a rule be added to PREC3 or in the Code of Practice, that allows carparking to be provided on the street in certain circumstances.	Seeks for a rule to be added to PREC3 or in the code of practice that allows carparking to be provided on the street in certain circumstances.	Open Submission

# RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Assessment criteria - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ-AC1: All infringements	Sandra Welsh	3.1	Support	Considers 299 Willowbank Ave should be rezoned to rural residential as this is now in the 50k zone and surrounded by residential and the Meeanee Hotel [currently Rural Production Zone]	Seeks rezoning of 299 Willowbank Ave from Rural Production Zone to rural residential	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Assessment criteria - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ-AC1: All infringements	Sandra Welsh	3.2	Amend	Considers 299 Willowbank Ave is subdividable as it is now in a 50k zone. Notes that there is a 299A registered on their property [refer Planning Maps]	Relief sought is unclear - suggests majority of Willowbank Ave is either already residential or would be suitable for residential - refer full submission [Inferred relief requested]	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Standards Table /RLZ-S8: Fencing	Susan Dallas	25.21	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.(Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Standards Table /RLZ-S8: Fencing	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.21	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Rules Table /RLZ-R3: Residential activities	WILL WORKMAN	89.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes RLZ (Rural Lifestyle Zone) and provisions including RLZ-R13A at Buchanan Street, Bay View. Considers that intensification will result in more infrastructural deficits, the loss of existing property values, rural amenity and the continued lack of consultation / notification of neighbouring property owners. Necessary intensification should be within brownfield not greenfield areas which have further capacity.	Seeks deletion of RLZ from Buchanan Street.(Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /	Rebecca Eng	99.80	Support	While existing National Grid assets are contained within the Rural Lifestyle zone, provisions relating to the operation, maintenance, upgrade and development of the National Grid are contained in the Network Utilities Chapter.  On the basis the Rural Lifestyle Zone Chapter does not apply to Network Utilities (and specifically the National Grid) in relation to:  - The operation, maintenance, upgrade and development of the National Grid;  - The effect of activities on the Grid.  Transpower seeks no relief in relation to the Rural Lifestyle Zone (RLZ). Should the RLZ apply, Transpower seeks provisions in the chapter to give effect to the NPSET.	On the basis the Rural Lifestyle Zone (RLZ) Chapter does not apply to Network Utilities, Transpower seeks no relief in relation to the Rural Lifestyle Zone. Should the RLZ apply, Transpower seeks provisions in the chapter to give effect to the NPSET.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Rules Table /RLZ-R5: Minor residential unit, a residential care facility, an education facility	Cameron Lloyd Kerry Beard Peter Oliver	120.1	Amend	Considers that RLZ-R5 (Minor residential unit, a residential care facility, an education facility) net site area should be reduced from 5000m2 to 4000m2 for Nos. 553, 555, 565, 567 Main North Road, Bay View as these properties are now precluded from Permitted Activity Status for an additional minor residential unit under the new rule despite being possible under the Operative Plan; lot sizes are larger than surrounding residential properties such as Rogers Road that does not have Rural character; have their own sewage treatment systems; and without intensification will result in the inefficient use of land that is too small for agricultural economic purposes.	Amend RLZ-R5 (Minor residential unit, a residential care facility, an education facility) as follows:  RLZ-R5A  Activity Status: Permitted  Where:  The activity complies with all of the Rural Lifestyle Zone Standards; The net site area is more than <del>5000</del> 4000 m2;	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Standards Table /RLZ-S2: Yards	Nick Wakefield	131.6	Support	The submitter supports the RLZ-S2: Yards Standard as having been successfully rolled-over from the Operative Plan consistent with achieving its Objectives and Policies; reducing productive land lost to the built-form; and having proven able to address potential reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain Standard RLZ-S2: Yards as notified.(Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission

# RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Rules Table /RLZ-R5: Minor residential unit, a residential care facility, an education facility	Alison Francis	139.3	Amend	Considers that a Minor residential unit should not be in the same category (RLZ-R5: Minor residential unit, a residential care facility, an education facility) as a residential care facility or an education facility given the residential versus commercial nature and the intensity of the effects, particularly around traffic movements. The Minor residential unit provision should be separated out and instead given the same performance standards as that of Minor residential units in the SETZ (Settlement Zone). As the lots in the Rural Lifestyle Zone are generally larger than those of the SETZ zone, a maximum distance requirement from the primary dwelling would ensure that Minor residential units are seen as supplementary to the primary dwelling on site and will not result in fragmentation of buildings on a site.	Amend RLZ-R5 as follows: RLZ-R5: <del>Minor residential unit, a residential care facility, an education facility</del> Amend RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Rules Table as follows: <u>RLZ-Rx: Minor Residential Units</u> <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>1. The activity complies with all of the standards of the Settlement Zone;</u> <u>2. No more than one minor residential unit per site, and</u> <u>3. The gross floor area of the unit must not exceed 80m<sup>2</sup></u> <u>4. The minor residential unit must be within 30m of the primary dwelling on sites.</u> <u>RLZ-RxB</u> <u>Activity status where activity conditions are not met:</u> <u>Discretionary.</u>	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Standards Table /RLZ-S7: Building coverage	Alison Francis	139.4	Amend	The submitter considers that there is a typo in RLZ-S7: Building coverage as the Standard references the "General Rural Zone". In addition, building coverage exceeding 10% or 1,000m <sup>2</sup> of the net site area would see the Activity status default to a Non-Complying Activity (RLZ-R8) which is considered excessive with the expectation being a Restricted Discretionary Activity in order to assess the degree of building coverage infringement relative to rural amenity.	Amend RLZ-R8: Any land use that does not comply with the Building Coverage Standards as follows: RLZ-R8: Any land use that does not comply with the Building Coverage Standards <u>Activity Status: <del>Non-complying</del> Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Matters for Discretion:</u> <u>1. How the proposal retains the open character of the surrounding Rural Lifestyle Zone</u> <u>2. The scale and design of proposed buildings</u> <u>3. How stormwater will be managed to minimise runoff</u>	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Introduction /	James Witham	165.44	Support	Supports introduction as it appropriately summarises key issues for the Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Retain the introduction to the Rural Lifestyle Zone as notified.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Issues /RLZ-I1: Inappropriately located rural lifestyle development can result in the irreversible loss of highly productive land and versatile soil	James Witham	165.45	Support	Supports Issue as it appropriately summarises lifestyles potential impact on productive soil.	Retain RLZ-I1: Inappropriately located rural lifestyle development can result in the irreversible loss of highly productive land and versatile soil as notified.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Issues /RLZ-I3: The potential for reverse sensitivity in rural environments	James Witham	165.46	Amend	Supports issue generally, however considers that the definition of 'reverse sensitivity' is narrow and only applies in circumstances where activities are established and more sensitive activities establish later. Notes that the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land directs priority to be given to land based primary production on Highly Productive Land, regardless of when it is established. Also notes objectives and policies of the PNDP supports primary production on Versatile Soils and the Rural Production Zone generally. Where sensitive activities are established and there is a change from one land based primary production activity to another the term 'reverse sensitivity' does not apply. Considers that the effects of land based primary production should be prioritised and sensitivity issues managed.	Amend RLZ-I3: The potential for reverse sensitivity in rural environments as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission: RLZ-I3: The potential for <del>reverse sensitivity</del> conflicts between uses in rural environments <del>Reverse sensitivity effects</del> Conflicts between uses can occur where conflicts arise between existing rural land uses and neighbouring rural lifestyle development and non-rural land uses <u>operate in close proximity</u> . Rural lifestyle development has the potential to <del>give rise to reverse sensitivity effects</del> <u>be sensitive to the amenity requirements with land based primary production</u> <del>which</del> and need to be managed to protect the productive potential of the Rural Production Zone, <u>and</u> highly productive land, and the viability of activities that rely on the rural area. All rural zones include working environments. The rural environment of Napier contains a diverse range of land uses including agriculture, horticulture, viticulture, residential, and rural residential activities. Rural lifestyle living can be in conflict with and, therefore, compromise adjacent land uses through complaints about the effects of rural activity such as noise.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Objectives /RLZ-O1: Choice of residential lifestyle living	James Witham	165.47	Support	Retain RLZ-O1: Choice of residential lifestyle living as notified.	Retain RLZ-O1: Choice of residential lifestyle living as notified.	Open Submission

# RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Objectives /RLZ-O2: Inappropriate subdivision, use, and development	James Witham	165.48	Amend	Supports RLZ-O2 generally, but does not meet the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land insofar as that this objective, nor any other in the zone, seeks to protect the productive capacity of Highly Versatile and Versatile Land. This should be in the values protected from degradation from inappropriate subdivision, use and development in the zone.	Amend RLZ-O2: Inappropriate subdivision, use and development as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission: RLZ-O2: Inappropriate subdivision, use and development Important natural features and landscapes, biodiversity, <u>highly productive, versatile land</u> , and cultural and heritage values are protected from subdivision, use, and development that may degrade those values from both individual proposals and cumulative effects.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Objectives /RLZ-O6: Reverse sensitivity	James Witham	165.49	Amend	Supports Objective RLZ-O6: Reverse sensitivity generally but considers the definition of 'reverse sensitivity' is narrow and only applies in circumstances where activities are established and more sensitive activities establish later. Notes that the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land directs priority to be given to land based primary production on Highly Productive Land, regardless of when it is established. Also notes objectives and policies of the PNDP supports primary production on Versatile Soils and the Rural Production Zone generally. Where sensitive activities are established and there is a change from one land based primary production activity to another the term 'reverse sensitivity' does not apply. Considers that the effects of land based primary production should be prioritised and sensitivity issues managed.	Amend RLZ-O6: Reverse sensitivity as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission: RLZ-O6: <del>Reverse sensitivity</del> <u>Conflicts of uses</u> Development in the Rural Lifestyle Zone does not compromise the <u>establishment and</u> efficient operation of rural activities.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Policies /RLZ-P2: Protect rural character and amenity values	James Witham	165.50	Support	Supports as the policy appropriately identifies matters that are relevant to the character and amenity of the Rural Lifestyle Zone and adjoining Zones.	Retain RLZ-P2: Protect rural character and amenity values as notified.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Policies /RLZ-P4: Manage development in the Rural Lifestyle Zone	James Witham	165.51	Support	Supports as the policy appropriately identifies and protects the values of the Rural Lifestyle Zone and gives effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land by protecting productive soils.	Retain RLZ-P4: Manage development in the Rural Lifestyle Zone as notified.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Policies /RLZ-P5: Reverse sensitivity	James Witham	165.52	Amend	Supports RLZ-P5: Reverse sensitivity generally but considers the definition of 'reverse sensitivity' is narrow and only applies in circumstances where activities are established and more sensitive activities establish later. Notes that the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land directs priority to be given to land based primary production on Highly Productive Land, regardless of when it is established. Also notes objectives and policies of the PNDP supports primary production on Versatile Soils and the Rural Production Zone generally. Where sensitive activities are established and there is a change from one land based primary production activity to another the term 'reverse sensitivity' does not apply. Considers that the effects of land based primary production should be prioritised and sensitivity issues managed.	Amend RLZ-P5: Reverse sensitivity as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission: RLZ-P5: <del>Reverse sensitivity</del> <u>Conflicts of uses</u> <u>Mange the establishment, design, and location of new sensitive activities and other non-productive activities adjacent in close proximity to the Rural Production Zone to avoid, where possible, or otherwise mitigate any actual or potential sensitivity and/or reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities and land based primary production activities.</u>	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Policies /RLZ-P6: Cumulative effects	James Witham	165.53	Amend	Supports policy generally as it is appropriate to include Versatile Land in the policy as defined by the Hawkes Bay Regional Council as it encompasses a wider range of soils that could be considered Highly Productive Land when the National Policy Statement is fully implemented in the region.	Amend RLZ-P6: Cumulative effects as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:  RLZ-P6: Cumulative effects  Use and development of the Rural Lifestyle Zone do not have adverse cumulative effects, that:  deplete the versatility and productivity of the soil resource, highly productive land <u>and/or highly versatile land</u> , or natural resources; avoid adverse effects on outstanding natural features, and mitigate impacts on significant landscapes, biodiversity, and/or heritage and cultural values.	Open Submission

# RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Rules Table /RLZ-R1: Agriculture, horticulture, and viticulture activities	James Witham	165.54	Amend	Considers that several of the matters of discretion are without policy foundation and do not prioritise land based primary production on Highly Productive Land and versatile soil. Considers that it is unclear why fire and pest control is necessary or appropriate for any or minor non-compliance with any or all of the required standards. It is difficult to find a causal nexus for most performance standards that a proposal would be non-compliant with and these matters. Additionally considers that, there is no policy foundation for these matters and no specific controls relating to matters of discretion under the permitted baseline, or specific relevant rules dealt with elsewhere for example, cultural and natural values. There are no criteria supporting the protection of and appropriate use of land for land based primary production in order to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Amend RLZ-R1: Agriculture, horticulture and viticulture activities as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission: ..... Matters of discretion are: 1. General assessment matters; 2. Visual and amenity values; 3. Rural characteristics and <u>amenity</u> values; 4. Risk to public health and safety, and the environment; 5. Infrastructure services; <del>6. Fire and pest control;</del> 7. Nature, scale and intensity of land use; <del>8. Ecological, aquatic and natural values;</del> 9. The effects on the open character of the zone; 10. The effects on the safety of people and property; 11. Cultural, ecological aquatic and natural values; 12. The effects on the maintenance, use and development of a watercourse or open drain, and 13. Cumulative effects. <u>x. The priority given to land based primary production activities on Highly Productive Land and Versatile Land.</u> <u>xx. Methods for mitigation for sensitive activities such as noise insulation, alternative locations, bedroom layout and other effective methods.</u> <u>xxx. the maintenance of the productive capacity of Highly Productive Land and Versatile Land</u>	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Rules Table /RLZ-R3: Residential activities	James Witham	165.55	Support	Supports the rule as it appropriately limits residential density and by proxy higher densities of sensitive activities in the zone.	Retain RLZ-R3: Residential Activities as notified.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Rules Table /RLZ-R5: Minor residential unit, a residential care facility, an education facility	James Witham	165.56	Amend	Considers that non-compliance with the rule should be the same as residential density as the effects with regard to sensitivity, amenity and others are likely to be similar or of an even larger scale. Non-complying activity status for non-compliance is more appropriate.	Amend non-compliance with RLZ-R5: Minor residential unit, a residential care facility, and education facility to be a Non-complying activity.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Standards Table /RLZ-S1: Density	James Witham	165.57	Amend	provision contains matters of discretion, despite being a non-complying activity as set out in RLZ-R3.	Delete matters of discretion, retain non-complying activity status.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Standards Table /RLZ-S3: Setback from highly productive land	James Witham	165.58	Amend	Supports the standard is largely, the scale of mapping highly productive land makes practical implementation difficult. A 30m setback from zone boundary with Rural Production Zone and/or any horticultural or viticultural activity may be simpler to implement consistently. If the provision is to be retained then Versatile Land as defined in the Regional Resource Management Plan should be included as this will include additional land with land uses that may have the same or similar effects.	Amend RLZ-S3 Setback from highly productive land as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission: Rural Lifestyle Zone Purpose: to protect highly productive land and avoid <del>reverse</del> sensitivity effects to land-based primary production activities. 1. No residential activity is located closer than 30 m from highly productive land <u>and/or versatile land.</u>	Open Submission



# RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Standards Table /RLZ-S4: Setback from land-based primary production	James Witham	165.59	Amend	Supports standard generally however considers the definition of 'reverse sensitivity' is narrow and only applies in circumstances where activities are established and more sensitive activities establish later. Notes that the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land directs priority to be given to land based primary production on Highly Productive Land, regardless of when it is established. Also notes objectives and policies of the PNPD supports primary production on Versatile Soils and the Rural Production Zone generally. Where sensitive activities are established and there is a change from one land based primary production activity to another the term 'reverse sensitivity' does not apply. Considers that the effects of land based primary production should be prioritised and sensitivity issues managed. In addition, the effects of primary production activities may be from locations that are more than just adjacent. A broader description is appropriate. In addition, the Rural Lifestyle Zone has a number of interfaces with the Rural Production zone. The actual or potential activities has the potential to generate sensitivity and reverse sensitivity effects. A buffer is appropriate	Amend RLZ-S4: Setback from land based primary production as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission: RLZ-S4: Setback from land based primary production Purpose: to protect rural activities and avoid reverse sensitivity effects to land-based primary production activities. 1. No residential activity is located closer than 30 m from a lawfully established land based primary production activity <u>and</u> 2. <u>Any Rural Production Zone boundary.</u>	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Assessment criteria - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ-AC2: All land uses	James Witham	165.60	Support	Supports the assessment criteria with one minor change recommended being the title of the reverse sensitivity effects criteria. The criteria appropriately addresses sensitivity effects and the title should be amended to add clarity.	Amend RLZ-AC2: All land uses as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission: .... <del>Sensitivity and R</del> reverse sensitivity effects	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Assessment criteria for particular land uses /RLZ-AC4: Residential care facilities, retirement complexes, travellers' accommodation, day care centres, and education facilities	James Witham	165.61	Support	Considers that the assessment criteria, in addition with the general criteria are appropriate to manage the effects. It is noted that this submission requests that these activities are deemed non-complying as a result of not meeting their relevant performance standards. This is the submitters preferred potion and if granted the criteria should be deleted. In the event they are not they should be retained as notified.	Retain RLZ-AC4 as notified, or delete if other relief sought by the submitter is granted.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Standards Table /RLZ-S2: Yards	Sheena McGuire	168.114	Amend	Supports this standard which requires a building setback of 6m from any side or rear boundary. however, seeks that this applies to structures as well to ensure that there is a safe setback from the corridor for not only buildings but all rural structures. Matters of discretion are also sought in the case that the setback cannot be achieved.	Amend as follows: 1. Front yards: a. no part of a building (including eaves and guttering) is erected closer than 7.5 m from the road boundary. 2. Side and rear yards: a. no part of a building is erected closer than 6 m from any side or rear site boundary. <u>b. No part of any building or structure may be located within a 5m setback from a boundary shared with a rail corridor.</u> Matters of discretion are: 1. Scale, height, bulk, setbacks and built form; 2. Rural characteristics and economic values; 3. Amenity values; 4. Spaces between structures and buildings; 5. Rural characteristics of the zone; 6. Risk to public health and safety and the environment; 7. The effects on the quality, maintenance, use, and protection of a watercourse or open drain; <u>8. The safe and efficient operation of the rail network;</u> <u>9. Compatibility with the surrounding environment; and</u> 10. The reason for the reduced setback.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Objectives /RLZ-O6: Reverse sensitivity	Angela McFlynn	169.2	Amend	Considers that the objective should be amended to clarify that reverse sensitivity concerns relate to permitted productive activities on surrounding land within the rural production zone as current objective.	Amend to: <b>RLZ-O6: Reverse sensitivity</b> Development in the Rural Lifestyle Zone does not compromise the efficient operation of rural activities <u>within the Rural Production Zone.</u>	Open Submission

# RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Policies /RLZ-P4: Manage development in the Rural Lifestyle Zone	Angela McFlynn	169.3	Amend	The availability of "highly productive land" for productive purposes is removed by virtue of zoning of land as Rural Production Zone land. Specifically, the District Plan proposes to adopt the definition of Highly Productive land in the NPS-HPL, which states that land is only considered highly productive land if it is zoned general rural or rural production. Development of Rural Production Zoned (Rural Lifestyle Zone Inferred) land therefore cannot have any impact on the productive capacity of highly productive land.	Amend to: <b>RLZ-P4: Manage development in the Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>  Use and development does not degrade the values associated with the rural environment by: <del>a. reducing the productive capacity of highly productive land and soils;</del> <del>b. locating development on highly productive land or versatile soils suitable for productive production;</del> c. diminishing biodiversity, natural character, or environmental qualities; d. disrupting ecological corridors between ecosystems; e. restricting access to waterbodies; f. compromising landscapes and their characteristics; g. degrading historic heritage features; h. adversely impacting on cultural values, and i. degrading rural amenity values. Relates to RLZ-O1, RLZ-O2, RLZ-O3, RLZ-O4, and RLZ-O5	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Policies /RLZ-P6: Cumulative effects	Angela McFlynn	169.4	Amend	Land within the Rural Lifestyle zone is intended to be developed and used for rural lifestyle purposes.	Amend as follows: <b>RLZ-P6: Cumulative effects</b>  Use and development of the Rural Lifestyle Zone do not have adverse cumulative effects, that: <del>- deplete the versatility and productivity of the soil resource, highly productive land, or natural resources;</del> - avoid adverse effects on outstanding natural features, and - mitigate impacts on significant landscapes, biodiversity, and/or heritage and cultural values. Relates to RLZ-O2, RLZ-O3, and RLZ-O5	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Standards Table /RLZ-S3: Setback from highly productive land	Angela McFlynn	169.5	Oppose	Opposes 30m setback from the boundary of any land within the Rural Productive Zone comprising highly productive land. Considers this as excessive, and not necessary protect against reverse sensitivity effects from residential activities. Considers that the setbacks required under standard RLZ-S2 are sufficient.	Delete this standard.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Standards Table /RLZ-S4: Setback from land-based primary production	Angela McFlynn	169.6	Oppose	Opposes a 30m setback from the boundary of any land-based primary production activity. Considers that this is excessive, and not necessary protect against reverse sensitivity effects from residential activities. Considers that setbacks required under standard RLZ-S2 are sufficient.	Delete this standard	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Standards Table /RLZ-S8: Fencing	Angela McFlynn	169.7	Amend	Considers that this standard should relate to boundary fences only. Considers that the determination of the appropriate height of non-boundary landscape / privacy fencing should be at the sole discretion of the landowner, and will not give rise to any adverse effects beyond the property.	Amend to: RLZ-S8: Fencing Rural Lifestyle Zone Any <u>boundary</u> fence <del>erected within front, side, and rear yards</del> must not exceed 2 m in height. Matters of discretion are:  1. The effects of shading; 2. The effects on amenity values; 3. The effects on streetscape; 4. The effects on public health and safety, and 5. The positive effects of fences to mitigate visual and noise effects of nearby land uses.	Open Submission

# RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Rules Table /	Angela McFlynn	169.8	Amend	Considers there is no provision for visitor accommodation within the Rural Lifestyle Zone. Considers that existing buildings should be able to be used for this purpose without the need to first obtain a resource consent.	Amend by adding new Rule: <b>RLZ-RX – Visitor Accommodation</b> RLZ-RXA Activity Status: Permitted Where: The activity is being carried out within an existing residential building.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Assessment criteria - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ-AC2: All land uses	Angela McFlynn	169.9	Amend	Considers that the rural lifestyle zone is intended for rural residential development. Considers that assessment criteria relating to effects on productive and versatile land or whether activities are compatible with activities more appropriately carried out within the Rural Production Zone are not relevant to the development and use of this land.	Amend assessment criteria RLZ-AC2 (r) and (x) as follows: <del>r. Whether the use of development is located on and utilises productive or versatile land.</del> x. Whether activities will complement primary production (agriculture, horticulture, and/or viticulture activities) and contribute to the social, cultural, and economic wellbeing of the community.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Policies /RLZ-P4: Manage development in the Rural Lifestyle Zone	Angela McFlynn	189.38	Amend	Considers that the availability of “highly productive land” for productive purposes is removed by virtue of zoning of land as Rural Production Zone land. Specifically, the District Plan proposes to adopt the definition of Highly Productive land in the NPS-HPL, which states that land is only considered highly productive land if it is zoned general rural or rural production. Development of Rural Production Zoned land therefore cannot have any impact on the productive capacity of highly productive land.	Amend RLZ-P4: Manage development in the Rural Lifestyle Zone as follows: RLZ-P4: Manage development in the Rural Lifestyle Zone Use and development does not degrade the values associated with the rural environment by: <del>a. reducing the productive capacity of highly productive land and soils;</del> <del>b. locating development on highly productive land or versatile soils suitable for productive production;</del> c. diminishing biodiversity, natural character, or environmental qualities; d. disrupting ecological corridors between ecosystems; e. restricting access to waterbodies; f. compromising landscapes and their characteristics; g. degrading historic heritage features;a h. dversely impacting on cultural values, and i. degrading rural amenity values.  Relates to RLZ-O1, RLZ-O2, RLZ-O3, RLZ-O4, and RLZ-O5	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Policies /RLZ-P6: Cumulative effects	Angela McFlynn	189.39	Amend	Considers that land within the Rural Lifestyle Zone (RLZ) is intended to be developed and used for rural lifestyle purposes.	Seeks to amend RLZ-P6: Cumulative effects to: RLZ-P6: Cumulative effects Use and development of the Rural Lifestyle Zone do not have adverse cumulative effects, that:  <del>- deplete the versatility and productivity of the soil resource, highly productive land, or natural resources;</del> - avoid adverse effects on outstanding natural features, and - mitigate impacts on significant landscapes, biodiversity, and/or heritage and cultural values.  Relates to RLZ-O2, RLZ-O3, and RLZ-O5	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Standards Table /RLZ-S3: Setback from highly productive land	Angela McFlynn	189.40	Oppose	Considers a 30m setback from the boundary of any land within the Rural Productive Zone (RLZ-S3: Setback from highly productive land) comprising highly productive land is excessive, and not necessary protect against reverse sensitivity effects from residential activities. The setbacks required under standard RLZ-S2 are sufficient.	Delete RLZ-S3: Setback from highly productive land in its entirety.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Standards Table /RLZ-S4: Setback from land-based primary production	Angela McFlynn	189.41	Oppose	Considers a 30m setback from the boundary of any land-based primary production activity is excessive in RLZ-S4: Setback from land-based primary production, and not necessary protect against reverse sensitivity effects from residential activities. The setbacks required under standard RLZ-S2 are sufficient.	Delete RLZ-S4: Setback from land-based primary production in its entirety.	Open Submission

# RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Assessment criteria - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ-AC2: All land uses	Angela McFlynn	189.42	Amend	Considers the rural lifestyle zone is intended for rural residential development. Assessment criteria (RLZ-AC2: All land uses) relating to effects on productive and versatile land or whether activities are compatible with activities more appropriately carried out within the Rural Production Zone are not relevant to the development and use of this land. Assessment of effects on amenity should be restricted to effects on the amenity of the zone in which the activity is proposed to be carried out.	Amend RLZ-AC2: All land uses as follows: <del>f. Whether the use of development is located on and utilises productive or versatile land.</del> u. Whether the establishment and operation of the land use would have adverse effects on the amenity of the Rural, Rural Lifestyle or Settlement Zones. x. Whether activities will complement primary production (agriculture, horticulture, and/or viticulture activities) and contribute to the social, cultural, and economic wellbeing of the community.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Assessment criteria for particular land uses /RLZ-AC3: Seasonal workers accommodation	Angela McFlynn	189.43	Amend	Considers residential activities are expected to be the predominant use within a rural lifestyle zone. It is not necessary to consider potential conflicts with primary production activities in association with the proposed establishment of seasonal workers accommodation (RLZ-AC3: Seasonal workers accommodation) in this zone.	Amend RLZ-AC3: Seasonal workers accommodation as follows: a. The capacity for providing water and waste services on site. b. Whether buildings and structures are compatible with rural amenity, of a similar design and scale to those used for rural activities, and vehicle parking and storage areas are screened from adjacent properties by fencing and/or landscaping. <del>c. The extent to which the land use is consistent with and supports primary production or may result in conflict with rural activities, rural production, or rural industry.</del> d. Whether the scale and design of the proposed building complements the character of the area. e. Whether the siting of the activity will impact on the amenity of the adjoining property. f. Whether traffic generation associated with the number of occupants will adversely impact on the road network.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Assessment criteria for particular land uses /RLZ-AC4: Residential care facilities, retirement complexes, travellers' accommodation, day care centres, and education facilities	Angela McFlynn	189.44	Amend	Considers the assessment of amenity effects associated with development (RLZ-AC4: Residential care facilities, retirement complexes, travellers' accommodation, day care centres, and education facilities) should relate only to effects in relation to the zone in which the activity is proposed to be undertaken.	Amend RLZ-AC4: Residential care facilities, retirement complexes, travellers' accommodation, day care centres, and education facilities as follows:  RLZ-AC4: Residential care facilities, retirement complexes, travellers' accommodation, day care centres, and education facilities  Compatibility with rural land use  a. Whether ..... j. Whether the establishment and operation of the land use would adversely affect the amenity of the Rural, Rural Lifestyle, Settlement Zones, the Jervois Development Area, or result in significant social or economic impacts.	Open Submission

# RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Rules Table /RLZ-R5: Minor residential unit, a residential care facility, an education facility	Cameron Lloyd	194.2	Amend	Wishes to Amend RLZ-R5A, line 2 states that a minor residential unit is permitted if the net site area is more than 5000m2. Submitter wants the net site area amended to 3000m2. The property 5 Villers Street currently falls under the Rural Residential Zone, the plan suggests the shift to the Rural Lifestyle Zone. Under the current zoning the properties could construct a major dwelling along with a supplementary unit. The property has a unique history going from one title to two. The proposed plan restricts the development to a one dwelling for land sizes under 5000m2 and it is not an option to have an additional minor residential unit, due to the properties overall land size. The occupiers had not received news of the proposed plan. 3000m2 is still a large enough size to sustain a dwelling and a minor residential unit while retaining the rural lifestyle character. Residential housing exists north of the area. Submitter wishes to maintain the rural character but develop their properties with an additional minor residential unit. Highlighted in attached document those properties all wish to build a minor residential unit. With the proposed plan changes land will be underutilised. If the property on 5 Villers Road can be grouped in the Settlement Zone, then the Rural Lifestyle zone seems to lose its meaning. The point here is that if we are to be categorized as the same as areas which have much higher density, then we should have the right to have an additional minor residential unit.	Seeks to Amend RLS-R5A to make the threshold 3000m2 for permitting a minor residential unit in addition to a dwelling in the Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Policies /	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.52	Amend	There is no specific policy guidance in the rural zones for minor residential units. To ensure that these are appropriately managed to achieve the objectives for the rural zones including in relation to highly productive land and rural amenity, an additional policy is sought in terms of how minor residential units are approached.	Add a new policy <u>To enable appropriate Minor Household units in rural zones, where they provide for separate accommodation in a manner that is visually integrated with the Principal Household Unit.</u> Or similar alternative relief.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Rules Table /RLZ-R5: Minor residential unit, a residential care facility, an education facility	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.54	Amend	There is no requirement under the rules for minor residential units to be within close proximity to the principal residential unit. This could result in significant visual amenity and rural character effects, as well as resulting in further fragmentation of highly productive land including through provision of separate driveways etc.	Add new activity conditions for minor residential units (as a separate activity rule) as follows: <u>a) Sites less than 100ha The Minor Household Unit shall be separated from the Principal Household Unit by a maximum distance of 6 metres on all sites less than 100ha in rural zones.</u> <u>b) Sites of 100 ha or greater The Minor Household Unit shall be separated from the Principal Household Unit by a maximum distance of 30 metres on all sites of 100ha or greater in rural zones.</u> Or similar alternative relief.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Assessment criteria for particular land uses /	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.56	Amend	There is currently no guidance in the rural zones for how to assess minor residential units that do not comply with the permitted activity standards. Matters of discretion and assessment criteria should provide guidance to ensure that these do not detract from the relevant objectives and policies for the zones.	Add matters of discretion and assessment criteria relating to rural character, external appearance, landform modification, density, visual impact, access, and highly productive land.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Issues /RLZ-I3: The potential for reverse sensitivity in rural environments	Georgina McPherson	215.126	Support	The Fuel Companies support RLZ-I3 as notified.	Retain RLZ-I3 as notified.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Objectives /RLZ-O6: Reverse sensitivity	Georgina McPherson	215.127	Amend	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this objective, however, oppose that it refers only to 'rural activities'. The Fuel Companies consider that reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities in the zone should also be managed.	Amend RLZ-O6 as follows: Development in the Rural Lifestyle Zone does not compromise the efficient operation of rural activities <u>or other lawfully established activities.</u>	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Policies /RLZ-P5: Reverse sensitivity	Georgina McPherson	215.128	Amend	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this policy, however, oppose that it refers only to 'primary production'. The Fuel Companies consider that reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities in the zone should also be managed.	Amend RLZ-P5 as follows: Manage the establishment, design, and location of new sensitive activities and other non-productive activities adjacent to the Rural Production Zone to avoid, where possible, or otherwise mitigate any actual or potential reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities, <del>and</del> land-based primary production activities <u>and other lawfully established activities.</u>	Open Submission

# RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Rules Table /General	Georgina McPherson	215.129	Oppose	Oppose the RLZ rules as they do not provide for existing service stations activities, including any alterations or additions to the existing activity. Alterations or additions is a discretionary activity or a non-complying activity under rule RLZ-R8. This is overly restrictive with respect to existing activities. The Fuel Companies seek a new discretionary activity for service stations, subject to it being an addition, alteration or rebuild to that activity. In addition, a consequential change is needed to the definition of 'alteration or addition' as the current definition relates only to heritage buildings or structure.	Add new rule as follows: <u>RLZ-RX: Service stations</u> <u>Activity status: Discretionary</u> <u>Where:</u> 1. The activity is an <u>addition, alteration or redevelopment of an existing service station.</u>	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Rules Table /RLZ-R6: Relocated buildings.	Sean Thompson	225.5	Amend	Considers that it is not self-evident from the analysis and rationale in the proposed plan, including in terms of s 32 RMA, why relocated buildings should be classified as non-complying in the NCZ, LCZ, LFRZ, LIZ and GIZ. It is accepted that relocated buildings should be Discretionary in the Natural Open Space Zone, and there may be urban design and other considerations applicable to the Town Centre Zone and City Centre Zone which warrant different treatment. Since a 2004 Central Otago Environment Court decision most local authorities in New Zealand have either adopted permitted activity classification for relocated buildings (with no standards) or provided for permitted activity status with prescribed performance standards.	Seeks to amend the relocated buildings activity PDP Rules as follows: a. Provide for relocated buildings as a permitted activity in all relevant zones like Rule RLZ-R6, excepting where a specified heritage or conservation or urban design consideration applies; b. For the relocated building rules in all zones, the removal of the requirement to deposit a monitoring fee at the same time as submitting the relocated building report; c. Amending the performance standards in relation to relocated buildings in accordance with the wording in the attached Schedule 1 (which can be found in the attached submission), to provide for: i. modification of the performance timeframes such that relocation on permanent foundation is required within two months, and twelve months is allowed for the completion of all reinstatement works; ii. provision for a pre-inspection report in the same or similar form as found in Schedule 2 (which can be found in the attached submission). Consequential or further relief including to the relevant objectives, policies and provisions of the proposed plan in order to give effect to relief sought. (The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Objectives /RLZ-O4: Services and infrastructure	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.55	Amend	Recommends the inclusion of 'additional infrastructure' into RLZ-O4 as it includes educational facilities within the definition. The Ministry is responsible for providing educational facilities to meet the demand and needs of growing communities. Educational facilities are a crucial form of infrastructure to allow communities to meet their social and economic wellbeing. The proposed amendment will allow for the residential communities in RLZ zones to have access to early childhood education or schooling should they need it. To achieve the best planning practice, educational facilities should be represented in the objectives and policies as well as its own rule framework of any zone that enables a residential population of some sort. The Ministry has a responsibility to provide educational support to those residential communities enabled by the RLZ. Therefore, the policy framework should recognise the need for educational facilities to support any rural community. Although the Ministry use the NoR process to designate school sites, in the Ministry's experience the objectives and policies of the relevant zone are important provisions which are used to assess NoR's. If this amendment is not supported by council, the Ministry would support a similar provision to what we have recommend in row 59 of this submission.	Seeks to make the following Amendment: <b>Services and infrastructure</b> Subdivision, use, and development supported by adequate servicing infrastructure <u>and additional infrastructure.</u> Relates to RLZ-I3	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Policies /RLZ-P2: Protect rural character and amenity values	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.56	Support	Supports the principles set out in this provision. The Ministry would expect that educational facilities would be assessed against these values and criteria.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Policies /RLZ-P4: Manage development in the Rural Lifestyle Zone	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.57	Support	Supports RLZ-P4 as it manages the effects of development on the rural environment. The Ministry would expect that educational facilities would be assessed against these criteria as well.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission

# RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Rules Table /RLZ-R5: Minor residential unit, a residential care facility, an education facility	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.58	Amend	Amend RLZ-R5 to allow for 30 people, as this will cater for day care facilities. Recommends that the term 'education facility' be changed to 'educational facility' to maintain consistency throughout the plan. The Ministry requests that educational facilities are provided for and enabled in the RLZ to serve the educational needs of the residential community and recommend a restricted discretionary activity status. The Ministry acknowledges that educational facilities can have effects on the surrounding environment and cause reverse sensitivity, but these can be managed through appropriate matters of discretion. The Ministry proposes the following matters of discretion to restrict council's assessment to relevant effects. The Ministry is responsible for providing educational facilities to meet the demand and needs of growing communities. Educational facilities are a crucial form of infrastructure to allow communities to meet their social and economic wellbeing. The proposed amendment will allow for the residential communities in RLZ zones to have access to early childhood education or schooling should they need it.	Seeks to Amend RLZ-R5 to the following: <b>Minor residential unit, a residential care facility, an educational facility</b> RLZ-R5A <b>Activity Status:</b> Permitted <b>Where:</b> 1. The activity complies with all of the Rural Lifestyle Zone Standards; 2. The net site area is more than 5000 m2; 3. The activity does not cater for more than <del>ten</del> 30 people; 4. A maximum of one non-rural activity may be undertaken on any site; 5. The combined gross floor area of these activities must not exceed 80 m2 (per site, not per activity), and 6. Access is to be shared with any primary dwelling on site. RLZ-R5B <b>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met:</b> Discretionary <b>Except for Educational Facility: Restricted Discretionary</b> <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> 1. <u>Scale, design, layout, setbacks and screening;</u> 2. <u>Reverse sensitivity on surrounding properties</u> 3. <u>Contribution to local community wellbeing;</u> 4. <u>Effects on the streetscape and neighbourhood character;</u>	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Assessment criteria for particular land uses /RLZ-AC4: Residential care facilities, retirement complexes, travellers' accommodation, day care centres, and education facilities	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.59	Amend	Requests that 'education facilities' be amended to read 'educational facilities' for consistency across the plan. The Ministry is also comfortable with the proposed assessment criteria on educational facilities.	Seeks to make the following amendment so education facilities be changed to educational facilities. Residential care facilities, retirement complexes, travellers' accommodation, day care centres, and educational facilities Compatibility with rural land use. a. Whether the impact of the scale and intensity of the use is compatible with surrounding rural land uses. b. Whether the land use's hours of operation would adversely affect the amenity, health, safety, and wellbeing of surrounding land uses and residents. c. Whether the volume of traffic likely to be attracted to the site is likely to cause an effect on the neighbouring people and environment, including the road network and traffic safety and efficiency. d. Whether the site is a suitable size for the type and number of persons being catered or cared for. e. Whether the proposed land use will have an adverse effect on any sites of significance to Māori, cultural values, or heritage values of the area. f. Whether the land use will contribute to the social, cultural, and economic well-being of the community, including for the purposes of diversifying land uses complementing primary production such as agriculture, horticulture, and/or viticulture activities. g. Whether the land use will contribute to the efficient use and/or development of natural and physical resources within the city and the availability of alternative sites and locations in an	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Rules Table /RLZ-R3: Residential activities	Darryl Wayne Hook	248.1	Oppose	Considers the rules relating to subdivision and minimum site area (2,500m2) should apply to all properties within the Rural Lifestyle Zone. There is a rule that only permits further site as a result of subdivision at 135 Ballantyne Road which is 5.4ha in area.	Seeks that all properties within this subdivision have RLZ-R3a minimum site area of 2,500 m2.	Open Submission

# RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Introduction /	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.119	Amend	Supports the introduction to the Rural Lifestyle Zone. Seeks for Council to broaden this introduction to recognise that rural lifestyle land use, needs to be carefully managed to avoid creating reverse sensitivity effects on existing established land uses including the land transport network. Considers that it is also important that traffic movements associated with rural lifestyle land use development are appropriately managed to ensure the safe and efficient function of the land transport network is not compromised.	Amend: RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone Introduction Overall, the natural and cultural values associated with rural land needs to be retained, and the potential to contribute to the economic wellbeing of the city is provided for with opportunities for generating supplementary income. <u>'Greenfield Growth in the Hills' and 'Regional Approach to industry' are key outcomes that are indirectly related to managing the distinctive elements of development in a rural environment. The Key Strategic Objectives relevant to planning for rural areas are Smart Growth, Quality Design and Environmental Excellence. Key Principles include 'Rural production in the Heretaunga Plains is enabled and protected'; 'Quality, high amenity and healthy environments to live, work and play', 'Economic activity and innovation is supported and enabled in appropriate locations' and 'Ecological assets and urban waterways are maintained and enhanced'.</u>  <u>To achieve these key objectives:</u>  - Opportunity exists for undertaking rural activities - The characteristic and functional needs of rural activities are recognised - Network infrastructure is not readily available. - The life-supporting capacity of soil and ecosystems are safeguarded; versatile land is valued and protected; earthworks and vegetation clearance on soils vulnerable to erosion is	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Issues /RLZ-15: The provision of alternative housing choice with rural setting is an attractive lifestyle	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.120	Support	Supports 15 as it recognises the conflict between existing land uses and lifestyle developments, and consider existing state highway activities are included.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Objectives /RLZ-O6: Reverse sensitivity	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.121	Amend	Supports the objectives of the Rural Lifestyle Zone, however, the draft objectives overlook the need to protect established infrastructure, including the state highway network, from both traffic and reverse sensitivity effects associated with incoming development.	Amend: <b>RLZ-O6: Transport Infrastructure</b> Development in the Rural Lifestyle Zone does not compromise the efficient operation of <u>existing infrastructure</u> and rural activities.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Policies /RLZ-P5: Reverse sensitivity	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.122	Amend	For consistency with submission above, seeks for Council to amend policy RLZ-P5 to include the state highway network	Amend as follows: <b>RLZ-P5: Reverse sensitivity</b> Reverse sensitivity effects and/or incompatible activities locating adjacent to the rural zone or <u>established infrastructure</u> or established productive rural activities do not unreasonably compromise rural activities and rural industry. Relates to RLZ-O2 <u>and RLZ-O6</u>	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Policies /RLZ-P6: Cumulative effects	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.123	Amend	Supports policy RLZ-P6. Seeks for Council to broaden this policy to ensure cumulative development does not cause adverse reverse sensitivity and/or traffic effects that compromise the safety, efficiency and function of the land transport infrastructure, including the state highway network.	Amend as follows: <b>RLZ-P6: Cumulative effects</b> Use and development of the Rural Lifestyle Zone does not have adverse cumulative effects, that; deplete the versatility and productivity of the soil resource or natural resources, • avoid adverse effects on outstanding natural features, • mitigate impacts on significant landscapes, biodiversity, and/or heritage and cultural values. • <u>Avoid compromising the safe and efficient function of the regional land transport infrastructure.</u>	Open Submission



# RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Rules Table /RLZ-R2: Rural produce retail activity	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.124	Support	Supports rule RLZ-R2 as it recognises the cumulative effect that roadside stalls and hoarding can have on the safety, efficiency and function of the state highway network. Notes that the state highway network typically provides a throughflow function and as such, is designed to carry more vehicles at higher speeds, particularly in rural environments. Considers cumulative roadside retail activities can create significant differences in speed between vehicles travelling on the state highway vs vehicles turning to ingress or egress a roadside activity. Where drivers are not anticipating vehicles accessing a roadside activity this can cause an unsafe road environment.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Assessment criteria - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ-AC2: All land uses	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.125	Amend	Supports the reverse sensitivity effects assessment criteria but request it includes the state highway network	Amend to include: <u>Whether the nature, size and scale of the activity, additional residential development or the development of other sensitive activities would have the potential to result in complaints against existing infrastructure due to differing amenity expectations.</u>	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Introduction /	Alan Petersen	281.2	Oppose	Considers there is a clear delineation between rural and residential environments in Bay View, and has been for years. There has been some minor residential development at the ends of Rogers Rd and Franklin Road in recently times.	Seeks to retain the minimum lot size at 1500m2 for non-serviced sites and 800m2 for services sites in the Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Policies /RLZ-P3: Allow adequate support services and infrastructure where appropriate	Alan Petersen	281.3	Oppose	Considers that a minimum lot size of 800m2 for serviced sites in Bay View and 1500m2 for unserviced sites in Bay View should be retained in the Rural Lifestyle Zone. Considers that additional development at 68 Franklin Road could not be considered urban sprawl. Considers that infrastructure should be improved for urban areas of Bay View. Seeks consistency of terminology between urban living and suburban living.	In the Bay View urban areas retain the minimum lot sizes to 1500m2 for non- serviced sites and 800m2 for serviced sites in the Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Issues /RLZ-I1: Inappropriately located rural lifestyle development can result in the irreversible loss of highly productive land and versatile soil	Alan Petersen	281.4	Oppose	At Bay View there has been very little development of inappropriate lifestyle development encroaching on highly productive versatile land. Bay View is located in close proximity to Napier and should therefore be seen as part of Napier.	The Bay View urban areas retain the minimum lot sizes to 1500m2 for non- serviced sites and 800m2 for serviced sites in the Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Issues /RLZ-I2: Cost and capacity of infrastructure	Alan Petersen	281.5	Oppose	Considers the reason for retaining Bay View within a rural environment is due to lack of infrastructure (wastewater). The majority of Bay View is connected to the wastewater network with the exception of approximately 300 homes. Council needs to remedy this.	Seeks to retain the minimum lot sizes to 1500m2 for non- serviced sites and 800m2 for serviced sites in the Rural Lifestyle Zone..	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Issues /RLZ-I3: The potential for reverse sensitivity in rural environments	Alan Petersen	281.6	Oppose	Considers reverse sensitivity is two-way. If the site at 68 Franklin Rd is used for rural land uses (as is permitted) the reverse sensitivity could be significant on existing residential properties. When the residential development proceeds there will not be any reverse sensitivity from those typical of rural activities. There is also separation of 20m wide of the rail corridor along the western side of the site.	Seeks to retain the minimum lot sizes to 1500m2 for non- serviced sites and 800m2 for serviced sites in the Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Objectives /RLZ-O1: Choice of residential lifestyle living	Alan Petersen	281.7	Oppose	Considers the Bay View residential environment is very similar to Westshore - which is the Northern Residential Zone in the Operative Plan & in the Proposed Plan to be in the General Residential Zone.	Seeks the retention of minimum lot sizes to 1500m2 for non-serviced sites and 800m2 for serviced sites in the Rural Lifestyle Zone of Bay View.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Objectives /RLZ-O2: Inappropriate subdivision, use, and development	Alan Petersen	281.8	Oppose	The residential development with an approved resource consent at 68 Franklin Rd was an appropriate development between 2008 and 2018 and in the recently lodged re-application.	Seeks the retention of minimum lot sizes to 1500m2 for non-serviced sites and 800m2 for serviced sites in the Rural Lifestyle Zone in Bay View.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Objectives /RLZ-O3: Rural character and amenity	Alan Petersen	281.9	Oppose	The proposed development at 68 Franklin Road is not in a rural environment, but is in an urban and coastal environment.	Seeks to retain the minimum lot sizes to 1500m2 for non- serviced sites and 800m2 for serviced sites in the Rural Lifestyle Zone in Bay View.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Objectives /RLZ-O4: Services and infrastructure	Alan Petersen	281.10	Oppose	The proposed development at 68 Franklin Road will be supported by adequate servicing infrastructure to the standard required in residential zones.	Seeks to retain the minimum lot sizes to 1500m2 for non- serviced sites and 800m2 for serviced sites in the Rural Lifestyle Zone in Bay View.	Open Submission

# RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Objectives /RLZ-O5: Lifestyle lot sizes maintain rural outlook	Alan Petersen	281.11	Oppose	Considers that the change in zoning from Rural Settlement Zone to Rural Lifestyle Zone for urban areas of Bay View, and the accompanying change in minimum lot size from 800m2 for serviced sites and 1500m2 for unserviced sites to a proposed minimum lot size of 2500m2 will be a major concern for residents.	Seeks to retain the minimum lot sizes to 1500m2 for non- serviced sites and 800m2 for serviced sites in the Rural Lifestyle Zone in the urban areas of Bay View.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Policies /RLZ-P3: Allow adequate support services and infrastructure where appropriate	Alan Petersen	281.12	Oppose	Infrastructure in Bay View needs to be upgraded. A lack of infrastructure shouldn't be the primary reason for not giving an area appropriate zoning. There needs to be consistent use of terminology, for example 'urban living' and suburban' are both used.	Seeks to retain the standards table from the Rural Settlement Zone.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Policies /RLZ-P4: Manage development in the Rural Lifestyle Zone	Alan Petersen	281.13	Oppose	The Bay View residential areas are already an urban environment. Nor will it reduce the productive capacity of highly productive land. Nor would it diminish the list of points "a" to "l" (p4).	Seeks to retain the Standards table from the Rural Settlement Zone.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Policies /RLZ-P6: Cumulative effects	Alan Petersen	281.14	Oppose	The Bay View residential areas are already an urban environment. Nor will it reduce the productive capacity of highly productive land. Nor would it diminish the list of points "a" to "l" (p4).	Seeks to retain the Standards Table from the Rural Settlement Zone.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Policies /RLZ-P5: Reverse sensitivity	Alan Petersen	281.15	Oppose	Considers reverse sensitivity is two-way. If the site at 68 Franklin Rd is used for rural land uses (as is permitted) the reverse sensitivity could be significant on existing residential properties. When the residential development proceeds there will not be any reverse sensitivity from those typical of rural activities. There is also separation of 20m wide of the rail corridor along the western side of the site.	Seeks to retain the Standards Table from the Rural Settlement Zone.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Rules Table /RLZ-R3: Residential activities	Alan Petersen	281.16	Oppose	Considers reverse sensitivity is two-way. If the site at 68 Franklin Rd is used for rural land uses (as is permitted) the reverse sensitivity could be significant on existing residential properties. When the residential development proceeds there will not be any reverse sensitivity from those typical of rural activities. There is also separation of 20m wide of the rail corridor along the western side of the site.	Seeks to retain the same Standards Table from the Rural Settlement Zone.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Standards Table /RLZ-S1: Density	Alan Petersen	281.17	Oppose	In the Bay View urban area density, yards, setback from highly productive land, setback from land- based primary production, setback from water, open drains, and stopbanks height, building coverage, fencing, aerials, lines and support structures, shelterbelts and plantations should all remain the same as the operative Rural Settlement Zone.	Seeks to retain the Standards Table from the Rural Settlement Zone.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Assessment criteria - Rural Lifestyle Zone /General	Alan Petersen	281.18	Oppose	These criteria are all proposed for the Rural Lifestyle Zone but are not suitable for a residential environment such as the Bay View urban areas. The areas of Bay View zoned Rural Settlement Zone in the PDP but are zoned Rural Settlement in the OPD, should be rezoned General Residential. The Bay View residential area is clearly not rural but urban or residential in nature. The site at 68 Franklin Rd, at the very least, should be included in the proposed Rural Lifestyle Zone. But as a fully serviced development it could also be rezoned to the General Residential Zone. The statements are applicable to the Bay View urban area and the development site.	The site at 68 Franklin Rd should not be rezoned as the Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Open Submission

# RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Rules Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.62	Amend	Fire and Emergency requires the ability to construct and operate emergency service facilities (i.e., fire stations) in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies. This means new fire stations may be necessary in any zone across the district in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Fire and Emergency notes that the effects of a fire station can be largely anticipated and, in the most part, do not differ to the effects of many activities that may be anticipated through rural and urban environments. Fire and Emergency requests that emergency service facilities are provided for as permitted activities in the larger, more extensive zones of the district to recognise the critical importance of emergency services to communities. In providing for emergency service facility as a permitted activity would mean that emergency service facilities would be controlled by the subsequent performance standards of each zone (such as height, height in relation to boundary, front yards, building coverage requirements). and the other relevant performance standards in other chapters (i.e., transport) to ensure that any effects are appropriately managed.	Seeks to include new permitted activity as follows: <b>xxx-Rx: Emergency service facilities</b> <u>Activity status: Permitted</u>  Or  To similar effect  And  any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.81	Amend	Fire and Emergency's main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008. SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank. Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB-S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply. A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes. In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure and that new connections under the water supply bylaw will not be granted where there is insufficient capacity available within the water supply network for the proposed activity.	Seeks to include a new performance standard as follows: <b>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</b> 1. All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available. 2. Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. <u>Matter of discretion:</u> 1. The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.  Or  To similar effect.  And  any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Objectives /RLZ-O4: Services and infrastructure	Alec Duncan	288.125	Support	Supports RLZ-O4 insofar as requires that subdivision, use and development be supported by adequate servicing infrastructure that has sufficient capacity and does not increase demand for upgrading or extension of public infrastructure.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Policies /RLZ-P3: Allow adequate support services and infrastructure where appropriate	Alec Duncan	288.126	Support	Supports RLZ-P3 insofar as requires that subdivision, use and development be supported by adequate servicing infrastructure that has sufficient capacity and does not increase demand for upgrading or extension of public infrastructure.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Rules Table /RLZ-R1: Agriculture, horticulture, and viticulture activities	Alec Duncan	288.127	Support	Supports RLZ-R1 insofar as the matters of discretion extend to consider fire control for agriculture, horticulture, and viticulture activities.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

# RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Assessment criteria - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ-AC2: All land uses	Alec Duncan	288.128	Amend	Supports RLZ-AC2(h) insofar as the assessment criteria includes consideration of whether adequate provision is made for water supply. However, Fire and Emergency requests specific reference to whether the development can be serviced by a firefighting water supply. Fire and Emergency supports RLZ-AC2 (o) insofar as the assessment criteria includes consideration of the extent to which the activity implements an approved fire management plan.	Amend as follows: RLZ-AC2 ... t. Whether adequate provision is made for water supply ( <u>including a suitable firefighting water supply</u> ), and stormwater disposal.	Open Submission

# RPROZ - Rural Production Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Standards Table /RPROZ-S6: Fencing (excluding post and wire or wire netting fencing)	Susan Dallas	25.20	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Standards Table /RPROZ-S6: Fencing (excluding post and wire or wire netting fencing)	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.20	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Objectives /RPROZ-O1: Activities on highly productive land	Tony Michelle	73.16	Support	Considers that RPROZ-O1: Activities on highly productive land is an important part of protecting primary production.	Retain RPROZ-O1: Activities on highly productive land as notified.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Objectives /RPROZ-O2: Activities on non-highly productive land	Tony Michelle	73.17	Support	Considers that RPROZ-O2: Activities on non-highly productive land is an important part of protecting primary production and ancillary activities.	Retain RPROZ-O2: Activities on non-highly productive land as notified.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Objectives /RPROZ-O4: Reverse sensitivity	Tony Michelle	73.18	Support	Considers that RPROZ-O4: Reverse sensitivity is an important part of protecting primary production activities from reverse sensitivity.	Retain RPROZ-O4: Reverse sensitivity as notified.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Objectives /General	Tony Michelle	73.19	Amend	Considers that a new Objective for functional / operational activities should be added that support primary production and need to be located in the RPROZ - Rural Production Zone.	Amend the RPROZ Objectives by including the following:  <u>RPROZ-OXXX: Non-primary production activities that support primary production or rely on a rural location or have a functional or operational need to locate in the Rural Production Zone are provided for.</u>	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Policies /RPROZ-P6: Reverse sensitivity	Tony Michelle	73.20	Support	Considers that RPROZ-P6: Reverse sensitivity is an important part of protecting primary production and ancillary activities from reverse sensitivity.	Retain RPROZ-P6: Reverse sensitivity as notified.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Policies /General	Tony Michelle	73.21	Amend	Considers that Policies should enable activities supporting primary production that have a functional / operational need to be located in the RPROZ - Rural Production Zone.	Amend the RPROZ - Policies Section by including the following:  <u>RPROZ-P8: Compatible activities.</u>  <u>a. Enable primary production activities that are compatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the Rural Production Zone.</u>  <u>b. Provide for other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located in the Rural Production Zone that are not incompatible with primary production.</u>	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R1: Primary production activities outside highly productive land	Tony Michelle	73.22	Amend	The submitter considers that primary production ancillary activities should be amended for inclusion in RPROZ-R1 otherwise RPROZ-R19 would see it default to non-complying activity status.	Amend the RPROZ-R1 title as follows:  RPROZ-R1: Primary production <u>and ancillary</u> activities outside highly productive land.  Otherwise RPROZ-R19 17 would see it default to non-complying activity status.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R2: Primary production activities within highly productive land	Tony Michelle	73.23	Amend	The submitter considers that RPROZ-R2: Primary production activities within highly productive land should be amended to include ancillary activities otherwise RPROZ-R19 would default to non-complying activity status.	Amend RPROZ-R2: Primary production activities by including the following wording:  RPROZ-R2: Primary production <u>and ancillary</u> activities within highly productive land.  Otherwise RPROZ-R19 17 would default to non-complying activity status.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Issues /RPROZ-I7: Expanding the economic base for primary production can introduce different types of activities into the rural zones	Matthew Morley	83.1	Oppose	Opposes the zoning of 33 Rogers Road as Rural Production Zone. Instead seeks Rural Settlement Zone for the reasons outlined in the submission.	Amend the zoning of 33 Rogers Road to Rural Settlement	Open Submission

# RPROZ - Rural Production Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /	Rebecca Eng	99.81	Support	While there are no existing National Grid assets within the Rural Production Zone, provisions relating to the development of the National Grid are contained in the Network Utilities Chapter.  On the basis the Rural Production Zone Chapter does not apply to Network Utilities (and specifically the National Grid) in relation to the development of the National Grid, Transpower seeks no relief in relation to the Rural Production Zone (RPROZ). Should the RPROZ apply, Transpower seeks provisions in the chapter to give effect to the NPSET.	On the basis the Rural Production Zone Chapter does not apply to Network Utilities (and specifically the National Grid) in relation to the development of the National Grid, Transpower seeks no relief in relation to the Rural Production Zone (RPROZ). Should the RPROZ apply, Transpower seeks provisions in the chapter to give effect to the NPSET	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Policies /RPROZ-P1: Use or development of highly productive land	Deborah Burnside	126.1	Amend	Considers this policy too onerous on mapped productive land, considers the drafting to be above the intent of NPS-HPL. Specifically seeks that home occupants are considered appropriate on productive land.	Amend this policy to more accurately reflect the NPS-HPL, including any changes to the NPS-HPL made by the new government in advance of the PDP being made operative.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R12: Home business	Deborah Burnside	126.2	Amend	Considers this rule too onerous on small business on mapped productive land. Seeks flexibility where businesses seek to establish in an existing building.	Amend RPROZ-R12A to delete condition (8), or alternatively amend condition (8) to state the home business on highly productive land should not occur outside of established buildings.  Amend RPROZ-R12B to delete the requirement for infringing condition (8) to be a non-complying activity and instead include it as a restricted discretionary activity.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Standards Table /RPROZ-S1: Yards	Nick Wakefield	131.7	Support	The submitter supports the RPROZ-S1: Yards Standard as having been successfully rolled-over from the Operative Plan consistent with achieving its Objectives and Policies; reducing productive land lost to the built form; and having proven able to address potential reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S1: Yards as notified.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Objectives /RPROZ-O1: Activities on highly productive land	Jimmy Guerin	134.16	Support	Considers that RPROZ-O1: Activities on highly productive land is an important part of protecting primary production.	Retain RPROZ-O1: Activities on highly productive land as notified.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Objectives /RPROZ-O2: Activities on non-highly productive land	Jimmy Guerin	134.17	Support	Considers that RPROZ-O2: Activities on non-highly productive land is an important part of protecting primary production and ancillary activities.	Retain RPROZ-O2: Activities on non-highly productive land as notified.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Objectives /RPROZ-O4: Reverse sensitivity	Jimmy Guerin	134.18	Support	The submitter considers that RPROZ-O4: Reverse sensitivity is an important part of protecting primary production activities from reverse sensitivity.	Retain RPROZ-O4: Reverse sensitivity as notified.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Objectives /General	Jimmy Guerin	134.19	Amend	Considers that a new Objective for functional / operational activities should be added that support primary production and need to be located in the RPROZ - Rural Production Zone.	Amend the RPROZ Objectives by including the following:  <u>RPROZ-OXXX: Non-primary production activities that support primary production or rely on a rural location or have a functional or operational need to locate in the Rural Production Zone are provided for.</u>	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Policies /RPROZ-P6: Reverse sensitivity	Jimmy Guerin	134.20	Support	Considers that RPROZ-P6: Reverse sensitivity is an important part of protecting primary production and ancillary activities from reverse sensitivity.	Retain RPROZ-P6: Reverse sensitivity as notified.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Policies /General	Jimmy Guerin	134.21	Amend	Considers that Policies should enable activities supporting primary production that have a functional / operational need to be located in the RPROZ - Rural Production Zone.	Amend the RPROZ - Policies Section by including the following:  <u>RPROZ-P8: Compatible activities.</u>  <u>a. Enable primary production activities that are compatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the Rural Production Zone.</u>  <u>b. Provide for other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located in the Rural Production Zone that are not incompatible with primary production.</u>	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R1: Primary production activities outside highly productive land	Jimmy Guerin	134.22	Amend	The submitter considers that primary production ancillary activities should be amended for inclusion in RPROZ-R1 otherwise RPROZ-R19 would see it default to non-complying activity status.	Amend the RPROZ-R1 title as follows:  RPROZ-R1: Primary production <u>and ancillary</u> activities outside highly productive land.  Otherwise RPROZ-R19 17 would see it default to non-complying activity status.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission

# RPROZ - Rural Production Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R2: Primary production activities within highly productive land	Jimmy Guerin	134.23	Amend	The submitter considers that RPROZ-R2: Primary production activities within highly productive land should be amended to include ancillary activities otherwise RPROZ-R19 would default to non-complying activity status.	Amend RPROZ-R2: Primary production activities by including the following wording:  RPROZ-R2: Primary production <u>and ancillary</u> activities within highly productive land.  Otherwise RPROZ-R <del>19</del> <u>17</u> would default to non-complying activity status.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Objectives	Deborah Burnside	147.1	Amend	Concerns the ability to enable home and other businesses to operate on rural productive land in a way that ensures the rural uses (rural production activities) can continue in an economically viable way. Seeks to enable additional housing developments to occur on land for family members.	Seeks to amend objective to enable home business and other businesses to operate on rural productive land in an effort to support rural productive uses to be continued in a viable fashion. Amend to enable housing developments on the rural property for family members.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Introduction /	James Witham	165.62	Support	Supports the introduction as it appropriately introduces some of the high level issues of the Rural Production Zone.	Retain the introduction as notified	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Issues /RPROZ-I1: The use of rural land for primary production provides economic opportunities	James Witham	165.63	Support	Support the issue as it appropriately identifies key issues for productive soils and the Rural Production Zone.	Retain RPROZ-I1: The use of rural land for primary production provides economic opportunities as notified.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Issues /RPROZ-I2: The irreversible loss of versatile soils and highly productive land to urbanisation and inappropriate use and development	James Witham	165.64	Support	Supports issue as it appropriately identifies key issues for productive soils and the Rural Production Zone.	Retain RPROZ-I2: The irreversible loss of versatile soils and highly productive land to urbanisation and inappropriate use and development as notified	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Issues /RPROZ-I3: The life-supporting capacity of versatile soils and highly productive land is to be protected	James Witham	165.65	Support	Supports issue as it appropriately addresses the issues facing productive soils in the Productive Rural Zone.	Retain RPROZ-I3: The life supporting capacity of versatile soils and highly productive land is to be protected as notified.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Issues /RPROZ-I4: Rural character and amenity can be undermined by increased development	James Witham	165.66	Support	Supports the issue however, the amenity of the zone includes functional buildings, structures and machinery used for land based primary production in the zone. Similarly, non-rural development can be sensitive to the amenity requirements from primary production activities.	Amend RPROZ-I4: Rural character and amenity can be undermined by increased development as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:  Increased development can dominate the rural landscape and compromise the low density built form and open space qualities of the rural setting and/or character.  Rural character includes key elements of spaciousness, vegetation, minimal buildings, low-density built form, and a primary production-oriented working environment. <u>This includes a number of basic and functional buildings, structures and machinery used to support land based primary production.</u> Important amenity values include an uncluttered landscape, a rural outlook, waterbodies, livestock, trees, shelterbelts, crops and pasture, and reasonable separation between buildings or clusters of buildings. Pressure to expand urban development into rural zoned areas and increases in the area of land covered by buildings, structures, and road can have adverse effects on rural amenity values and conflict with the rural character of the zone.  While roadside stalls and home business support economic activity and are important for many rural holdings, other non-rural uses may have adverse effects on rural amenity, <u>be sensitive to the operational requirements of rural activities</u> , create traffic problems, and compete with activities in the city's commercial areas.	Open Submission

# RPROZ - Rural Production Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Issues /RPROZ-I5: Reverse sensitivity needs to be managed to ensure primary production activities can operate	James Witham	165.67	Amend	Supports the policy generally, however, the definition of 'reverse sensitivity' is narrow and only applies in circumstances where activities are established and more sensitive activities establish later. Notes that the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land directs priority to be given to land based primary production on Highly Productive Land, regardless of when it is established. the Objectives and Policies of the Proposed Napier District Plan, supports primary production on Versatile Soils and the Rural Production Zone generally. Considers that where sensitive activities are established and there is a change from one land based primary production activity to another, the term 'reverse sensitivity' does not apply. The effects of land based primary production should be prioritised and sensitivity issues managed. In addition, the effects of primary production activities may be from locations that are more than just adjacent. A broader description is appropriate.	Amend RPROZ-I5: Reverse sensitivity needs to be managed to ensure primary production activities can operate as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:  There is potential for <del>reverse</del> sensitivity effects where conflicts arise between existing <del>or changes in</del> rural land uses, <del>and new types of</del> rural production and neighbouring residential and non-rural land uses. <del>Reverse</del> Sensitivity effects need to be managed so as not to constrain land-based primary production activities and to protect the productive potential of the land and the viability of activities that rely on the rural area.  Residential and rural-residential land uses in a rural environment can compromise <del>adjacent</del> rural land uses through complaints about the effects of rural activity, including noise and odour. The levels of amenity within the Rural Production Zone are different to those in a residential zone, and there is potential for conflict particularly at the interface of zone boundaries.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Objectives /RPROZ-O1: Activities on highly productive land	James Witham	165.68	Amend	Supports objective generally but considers that it requires amendment to appropriately reflect the matters set out in the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land, including the prioritisation of land based primary production on Highly Productive Land.	Amend RPROZ-O1: Activities on highly productive land as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:  Highly productive land is protected <u>and prioritised</u> for use in land-based primary production, both now and for future generations.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Objectives /RPROZ-O2: Activities on non-highly productive land	James Witham	165.69	Support	Supports as the objective appropriately supports primary production activities on versatile soils.	Retain RPROZ-O2: Activities on non-highly productive land as notified.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Objectives /RPROZ-O4: Reverse sensitivity	James Witham	165.70	Amend	Supports the policy generally, however, the definition of 'reverse sensitivity' is narrow and only applies in circumstances where activities are established and more sensitive activities establish later. Notes that the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land directs priority to be given to land based primary production on Highly Productive Land, regardless of when it is established. the Objectives and Policies of the Proposed Napier District Plan, supports primary production on Versatile Soils and the Rural Production Zone generally. Considers that where sensitive activities are established and there is a change from one land based primary production activity to another, the term 'reverse sensitivity' does not apply, however, the effects of land based primary production should be prioritised and sensitivity issues managed.	Amend RPROZ-O4: Reverse sensitivity as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:  RPROZ-O4: <del>Reverse sensitivity</del> <u>Activities sensitive to rural amenity</u>  Non-rural activities must support primary production and avoid or otherwise mitigate <del>reverse</del> sensitivity effects that may compromise rural activities.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Objectives /RPROZ-O5: Cumulative effects	James Witham	165.71	Support	Supports as the objective appropriately sets a framework for managing cumulative effects on highly productive land.	Retain RPROZ-O5 Cumulative effects as notified.	Open Submission



# RPROZ - Rural Production Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Policies /RPROZ-P1: Use or development of highly productive land	James Witham	165.72	Amend	Notes that the policy attempts to express the matters set out in 3.9 to 3.13 of the National Policy Statement of Highly Productive Land. However considers that it does not do so in a way that gives effect to it in an accurate manner, which consequentially amends the directed policy framework and therefore, the policy does not give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	<p>Amend RPROZ-P1: Use or development of highly productive land as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:</p> <p>RPROZ-P1: Use or development of highly productive land Ensure</p> <p><u>1. Highly Productive Land and Versatile Land is used for, and priority given to, appropriate land based primary production and;</u></p> <p>2. <del>the inappropriate</del> use or development of Highly Productive Land and Versatile Land <u>is avoided, except that;</u></p> <p><u>a. The uses set out in section 3.9 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land are not inappropriate, and</u></p> <p><u>b. The maintenance, operation or upgrade of existing activities is enabled;</u></p> <p><u>While</u></p> <p>c. <del>minimises or mitigates</del> <u>minimising or mitigating</u> any actual or potential cumulative loss of the availability or productive potential of highly productive land <del>by:</del> <u>and,</u></p> <p>d. <del>It avoids</del> the fragmentation of large of geographically cohesive areas of productive land <u>is avoided, and</u></p> <p>e. <u>Reverse sensitivity effects are avoided if possible or</u></p>	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Policies /RPROZ-P2: Rural land use outside of highly productive land	James Witham	165.73	Amend	Supports policy generally, however, should be amended to recognise the priority given to land based primary production by the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	<p>RPROZ-P2: Rural land use outside highly productive land</p> <p>Primary production activities continue to have <u>priority</u> access to versatile land by:</p> <p>a. enabling rural industry outside of highly productive land;</p> <p>b. ensuring that activities that remove vegetation and alter the contour of the land do not cause the loss of versatile soils through earthworks or habitats of indigenous species located in water margins;</p> <p>c. ensuring that versatile soil remains available for rural production activities, and</p> <p>d. avoiding activities that are incompatible with primary production activities.</p>	Open Submission

# RPROZ - Rural Production Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Policies /RPROZ-P3: Rural character and amenity	James Witham	165.74	Amend	Supports the policy, however, c. does not reflect the actual or potential amenity of buildings associated with a largely working environment. Considers that the amenity associated with primary production activities is not appropriately identified and provided for and therefore does not give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Amend RPROZ-P3: Rural character and amenity as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:  RPROZ-P3: Rural character and amenity  Rural areas retain a sparse building density, open character, natural features, amenity values, and a sense of openness, with the elements that characterise an area as Rural Production Zone including:  a. a landscape dominated by openness and vegetation;  b. significant visual separation between residential buildings on neighbouring properties;  c. <del>buildings are generally integrated into a predominantly natural setting</del> functional buildings and machinery associated with primary production; <del>and</del>  d. there are natural character elements of waterways, waterbodies, indigenous vegetation and natural landforms, including the coastal environment <del>and</del> ;  e. <u>noise, odour, light, vibration and glare associated with primary production activities.</u>	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Policies /RPROZ-P5: Protection of rural values	James Witham	165.75	Support	Supports as the policy appropriately managed rural productive amenity, subject to the relief sought by the submitter regarding RPRO-P3 Rural character and amenity.	Retain RPROZ-P5: Rural character and amenity as notified, subject to the relief sought by the submitter for RPRO-P3 Rural character and amenity being accepted.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Policies /RPROZ-P6: Reverse sensitivity	James Witham	165.76	Amend	Supports the policy generally, however, the definition of 'reverse sensitivity' is narrow and only applies in circumstances where activities are established and more sensitive activities establish later. Notes that the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land directs priority to be given to land based primary production on Highly Productive Land, regardless of when it is established. the Objectives and Policies of the Proposed Napier District Plan, supports primary production on Versatile Soils and the Rural Production Zone generally. Considers that where sensitive activities are established and there is a change from one land based primary production activity to another, the term 'reverse sensitivity' does not apply. In addition, for clarity, the term 'constructed' has been included as an action to more clearly provide for mitigation measures such as the installation of insulation as an example.	Amend RPROZ-P6: Reverse sensitivity as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:  RPROZ-P6: Reverse sensitivity <u>and conflicts of uses</u>  Manage the establishment, design, <u>construction</u> and location of new sensitive activities and other non-productive activities in the Rural Production Zone to avoid where possible or otherwise mitigate any actual or potential <u>sensitivity and/or</u> reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities and land-based primary production.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Policies /RPROZ-P7: Cumulative effects	James Witham	165.77	Support	Support as the policy generally appropriately reflects the matters set out and gives effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Retain RPROZ-P7: Cumulative effects as notified	Open Submission

# RPROZ - Rural Production Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R1: Primary production activities outside highly productive land	James Witham	165.78	Amend	Considers that several of the matters of discretion are without policy foundation. It is unclear why fire and pest control is necessary or appropriate for any or minor non-compliance with any or all of the required standards. Considers that it is difficult to find a causal nexus for most performance standards that a proposal would be non-compliant with and these matters. Also there is no policy foundation for these matters and no specific controls relating to matters of discretion under the permitted baseline, or specific relevant rules dealt with elsewhere for example, cultural and natural values. There are no criteria supporting the protection of and appropriate use of land for land based primary production.	Amend PRPROZ-R1: Primary Production activities outside Highly Productive Land as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:  PRPROZ-R1: Primary Production activities outside Highly Productive Land <u>and versatile land</u>  ..... Matters of discretion are:  1. Rural characteristics <u>and amenity</u> , and economic values;  2. Risk to public health and safety, and the environment;  <del>3. Fire and pest control;</del>  4. Nature, scale and intensity of land use;  <del>5. Ecological, aquatic and natural values;</del>  6. The cumulative effect of non-compliance with more than one standard;  7. The effects on the open character of the zone;  8. The effects on the safety of people and property;	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R2: Primary production activities within highly productive land	James Witham	165.79	Amend	Considers that Several of the matters of discretion are without policy foundation, for example, it is unclear why fire and pest control is necessary or appropriate for any or minor non-compliance with any or all of the required standards. Considers that it is difficult to find a causal nexus for most performance standards that a proposal would be non-compliant with and these matters. Also considers that there is no policy foundation for these matters and no specific controls relating to matters of discretion under the permitted baseline, or specific relevant rules dealt with elsewhere for example, cultural and natural values. There are no criteria supporting the protection of and appropriate use of land for land based primary production. The ability of a soil scientist on their determining appropriate crops or usability of a piece of land is questionable. Considers that it is more appropriate that this task is undertaken by an agronomist or a combination of the two.	Amend as below  PRPROZ-R2: Primary Production activities within Highly Productive Land <u>and versatile land</u>  RPROZ-R2A  Activity status: Permitted Where:  1. the activity and any buildings or structure complies with all the Rural Production Zone Standards, and  2. The activity is a land based primary production activity  RPROZ-R2B  Activity Status where conditions and standards of RPROZ-2A are not met: Restricted Discretionary  Where:  1. The activity is a supporting activity, and  2. The application complies with RPROZ-R2-REQ1 RPROZ-R2-REQ1  1. Any application under rule RPRO-R2A must include a productive capacity assessment report prepared by a suitably	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R5: Residential activities and associated buildings and structures (excluding minor residential units)	James Witham	165.80	Support	Support as the rule appropriately limits the introduction of sensitive activities in the Rural Production Zone.	Retain RPROZ-R5: Residential activities and associated buildings and structures (excluding minor residential units) as notified	Open Submission

# RPROZ - Rural Production Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R6: Minor residential unit	James Witham	165.81	Support	Supports as the rule appropriately limits the introduction of sensitive activities in the Rural Production Zone.	Retain RPROZ-R6: Minor residential unit as notified	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R7: Residential care facility	James Witham	165.82	Support	Support as the rule appropriately limits the introduction of sensitive activities in the Rural Production Zone.	Retain RPROZ-R7: Residential care facility as notified	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R8: Day care centre	James Witham	165.83	Support	Support as the rule appropriately limits the introduction of sensitive activities in the Rural Production Zone.	Retain RPROZ-R8: Day care facility as notified	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R9: Education facility	James Witham	165.84	Support	Supports as the rule appropriately limits the introduction of sensitive activities in the Rural Production Zone.	Retain RPROZ-R9: Education facility as notified	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R10: Travellers' accommodation	James Witham	165.85	Support	Supports as the rule appropriately limits the introduction of sensitive activities in the Rural Production Zone.	Retain RPROZ-R10: Travellers accommodation as notified	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Standards Table /RPROZ-S3: Setback from highly productive land	James Witham	165.86	Amend	Considers that the scale of mapping highly productive land makes practical implementation difficult, though the standard is largely supported. Considers that a 30m setback from a boundary for non-rural activities may be simpler to implement.	Amend RPROZ-S3: Setback from highly productive land as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:  RPROZ-S3: Setback from highly productive land Rural Production Zone  Purpose: to protect highly productive land and avoid reverse-sensitivity effects to land based primary production activities.  1. No residential sensitive activity is located closer than 30 m from highly productive land a boundary with a site zoned Rural Production Zone.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Standards Table /RPROZ-S4: Height	James Witham	165.87	Amend	Considers that the provisions do not adequately provide for frost fans, a recognised part of the rural amenity in the Heretaunga Plains. The provisions in 1 would not include fan blades. Considers that, for clarity, amendment to specifically provide for frost fans would be appropriate and would better give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Amend RPROZ-S4: Height as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:  RPROZ-S4: Height Rural Production Zone  Purpose: to ensure airport safety, to maintain rural character and amenity, to manage effects of large structures.  1. This standard does not apply to aerials, lines and support structures  2. No part of a building or structure exceeds 9m in height, excluding frost fans which must not exceed 15m.  3. No part of a building, structure, or tree exceeds the Airport Height Control Designation in APP1.  Matters of discretion are:...  x. The priority given to land based primary production activities on Highly Productive Land and Versatile Land.	Open Submission

# RPROZ - Rural Production Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Standards Table /RPROZ-S5: Building coverage	James Witham	165.88	Amend	Notes that the construction of a frost fan consists of a flush concrete plinth, a low rise engine box, a tower and fan blades. Considers that it is probable in most instances that the low level engine cover will be screened from non-associated properties by the crops and/or shelter cover for that crop which leaves the tall and slim line fan tower and blades. These structures will not result in or exacerbate the bulk effects that the provision outlines in its purpose. Considers that as such it is appropriate, and to better give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land, that they are explicitly excluded from the calculation of building coverage. It is noted that there is no definition of 'gross building area' in the plan.	Amend RPROZ-S5: Building coverage as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:  RPROZ-S5: Building coverage Rural Production Zone  Purpose: to maintain the rural character, to maintain residential amenity in a rural setting; to control dominance, shading, privacy and sunlight access; and on erosion and waterbodies.  1. Building coverage (measured from gross building area) must not exceed 10% or 2,500m <sup>2</sup> of the net site area, whichever is the lesser.  Note: Netting structures, <u>frost fans</u> and greenhouses (where crops grown under or within those structures are grown directly in the soil of the site) are excluded from total building coverage calculations.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R3: Rural industry and associated buildings and structures	Sheena McGuire	168.115	Support	Supports this rule which requires any building or structure associated with rural industry to be setback by a minimum of 15m from any site boundary.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R4: Rural produce retail activity	Sheena McGuire	168.116	Amend	Notes that without appropriate setback requirements for rural produce retail activities, there is significant risk of adverse health and safety effects impacting occupants locating activities in proximity to the railway corridor. Seeks a new clause within RPROZ-R4A to require a 5m setback for structures and buildings from the rail corridor.	RPROZ-R4A  Activity Status: Permitted Where:  1. The activity is ancillary to a primary production activity located on the same site;  2. The maximum area occupied by a rural produce retail activity is 10 m <sup>2</sup> and there is no more than one per site;  3. The activity is not located on or adjacent to a state highway, or arterial road, and  4. The stall selling produce is located on the same site where the produce is grown.  <u>5. No part of any building or structure may be located within a 5m setback from a boundary shared with a rail corridor.</u>	Open Submission

# RPROZ - Rural Production Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Standards Table /RPROZ-S1: Yards	Sheena McGuire	168.117	Amend	Notes that the RPROZ Chapter does not contain a specific rail corridor building setback standard. Instead, the rail corridor boundary is assessed as a side or rear yard site boundary and a 6m building setback applies. Seeks a new clause within RPROZ-S1 to specifically require a 6m setback for structures and buildings from the rail corridor for clarity. Matters of discretion are also sought in the case that the setback cannot be achieved.	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Front yard:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. no part of a building (including eaves and guttering) is erected closer than 7.5 m to the road boundary.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Side and rear yards:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. no part of a building is erected closer than 6 m from any side or rear boundary.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Rail corridor setbacks:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>No part of any building or structure may be located within a 5m setback from a boundary shared with a rail corridor.</u></li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Scale and intensity of land use;</li> <li>2. Scale, height, bulk, setbacks, and built form;</li> <li>3. Risk to public health and safety and the environment;</li> <li>4. Cumulative effect;</li> <li>5. The effects on rural character;</li> </ol>	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Policies /RPROZ-P1: Use or development of highly productive land	Angela McFlynn	169.11	Amend	Considers that policies of the district plan should be consistent with the NPS-HPL. Notes that the NPS-HPL does not restrict the use of highly productive land to land-based primary production activities. Considers that the policy should be amended to provide certainty to the public regarding the nature of activities that are not land based primary production activities, but are considered appropriate in this location (e.g., supporting activities such as owners/farm managers accommodation).	Amend to include reference to activities that are considered appropriate as specified in clause s3.9(2) of the NPS-HPL.	Open Submission

# RPROZ - Rural Production Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R5: Residential activities and associated buildings and structures (excluding minor residential units)	Angela McFlynn	169.12	Amend	Notes that the construction of one dwelling on a rural property to provide accommodation for the owner or farm manager is specifically anticipated by the NPS-HPL as a supporting activity. Considers it inappropriate to prevent the owner of a property from residing on their land, or where they reside elsewhere, providing on-site farm manager accommodation for security. Considers the permitted size of buildings for supporting activities is appropriately controlled by Standard RPROZ-S5 – Building coverage. Notes that intentional inconsistency with NPS-HPL would require the removal of the reference to “subdivision” from any evaluation report required to support an application for land use consent.	<p>Amend to:</p> <p>RPROZ-R5: Residential activities and associated buildings and structures (excluding minor residential units)</p> <p>RPROZ-R5A</p> <p>Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The activity complies with all of the Rural Production Zone Standards.</li> <li>One residential unit per site where the net site area of the site is larger than 2,500 m2.</li> <li><del>The activity is not located on highly productive land.</del></li> </ol> <p><del>RPROZ-R5B</del></p> <p><del>Activity Status where condition 3 is not met: Restricted Discretionary</del></p> <p>-</p> <p><del>Where:</del></p> <p>-</p> <p><del>The activity is ancillary to land-based primary production activity within the same site.</del></p>	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R6: Minor residential unit	Angela McFlynn	169.13	Amend	Considers that the construction of minor residential unit on a rural property to provide accommodation for the owner or farm manager is specifically anticipated by the NPS-HPL as a supporting activity. Considers it inappropriate to prevent the owner of a property from residing on their land, or where they reside elsewhere, providing on-site farm manager accommodation for security. Considers the permitted size of buildings for supporting activities is appropriately controlled by Standard RPROZ-S5 – Building coverage. Notes that intentional inconsistency with NPS-HPL would require the removal of the reference to “subdivision” from any evaluation report required to support an application for land use consent.	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>RPROZ-R6: Minor residential unitRPROZ-R6A</p> <p>Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The activity complies with all of the Rural Production Zone standards.</li> <li>One minor residential unit per site where the site is larger than 5,000 m2; and               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The minor residential residential unit is less than 80 m2 in gross floor area;</li> <li>The minor residential unit shares access with the primary residential unit onsite.</li> </ol> </li> <li><del>The activity is not located on Highly Productive Land.</del></li> </ol> <p>-</p> <p><del>RPROZ-R6B</del></p> <p><del>Activity Status where condition RPROZ-R6A-3 is not met: Restricted discretionary</del></p> <p>-</p> <p><del>Where:</del></p> <p><del>The activity is ancillary to the land-based primary production activity within the same site. The application complies with RPROZ-R6B-REQ1</del></p> <p>-</p> <p><del>RPROZ-R6B-REQ1</del></p> <p>-</p> <p><del>As a discretionary activity, RPROZ-R6A must include a condition</del></p>	Open Submission

# RPROZ - Rural Production Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R10: Travellers' accommodation	Angela McFlynn	169.14	Amend	Considers the name of the rule should be amended to "Visitor Accommodation" to be consistent with the definitions provided within the District Plan. Considers that existing buildings should be able to be used for this purpose without the need to first obtain a resource consent.	Amend to:RPROZ-R10: <del>Travellers'</del> <u>Visitor</u> accommodation  Activity Status: <del>Non-complying</del> RPROZ-R10A  Activity Status: <del>Non-Complying</del> Permitted  <u>Where:</u>  1. <u>The activity is being carried out within an existing residential building.</u>  <u>RPROZ-ROB</u>  Activity Status where conditions are not met: <u>Non-Complying</u>  <u>NA</u>	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R12: Home business	Angela McFlynn	169.15	Amend	Considers that home occupations are frequently carried out within an existing dwelling / accessory building. Considers that it is irrelevant whether the existing building has been established on highly productive land, and this in itself should not be a trigger for requiring resource consent.	Amend to:  RPROZ-R12: Home business  RPROZ-R12A  Activity Status: Permitted  <u>Where:</u>  ... 8. The activity is not located on highly productive land, <u>or will be carried out within an existing building.</u>	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Standards Table /RPROZ-S3: Setback from highly productive land	Angela McFlynn	169.17	Oppose	Opposes the 30m setback from the boundary of any highly productive land is excessive, and not necessary protect against reverse sensitivity effects from residential activities. Considers that the setbacks required under standard RPROZ-S1 are sufficient and that the setback should also relate only to highly productive land on an adjoining title. Considers this is neither sensible nor practical to require a residential activity to be located 30m from highly productive land contained within the same property.	Delete this standard.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Issues /RPROZ-I6: Some rural land uses have cumulative effects on natural and physical resources	Jeremy Harding	177.5	Oppose	Considers the Rural Production Zone primary function is for primary production, but is geared towards agriculture, horticulture, and viticulture land uses and not primary production as defined in the Interpretation section of the proposed plan ie not quarrying. This is made clear in the chapter's introduction and throughout.  Sometimes the term land-based primary production activities is used but it still excludes quarrying.  RPROZ-I6 goes as far as specifying gravel extraction and quarrying as activities which are depleting natural resources.	No relief sought.	Open Submission



# RPROZ - Rural Production Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Policies /RPROZ-P3: Rural character and amenity	Angela McFlynn	189.30	Amend	Considers that the separation between residential buildings on properties is a private matter between neighbours by virtue of the Deemed Permitted Boundary Activity provisions of the RMA, and is not something that can be dictated by Council.	Amend RPROZ-P3: Rural character and amenity as follows:  RPROZ-P3: Rural character and amenity  Rural areas retain a sparse building density, open rural character, natural features, amenity values, and a sense of openness, with the elements that characterise an area as Rural Production Zone including:  a. a landscape dominated by openness and vegetation; b. <del>significant visual separation between residential buildings on neighbouring properties;</del> c. buildings are generally integrated into a predominantly natural setting, and d. there are natural character elements of waterways, waterbodies, indigenous vegetation and natural landforms, including the coastal environment.  Relates to RPROZ-O1, RPROZ-O2, RPROZ-O3, RPROZ-O4, and RPROZ-O5	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R2: Primary production activities within highly productive land	Angela McFlynn	189.31	Amend	Considers that with regards to RPROZ-R2-REQ1 it is inappropriate to require evidence to confirm that subdivision will not result in adverse effects in association with applications for land use consent that do not include subdivision.	Amend RPROZ-R2-REQ1 and remove the requirement to evaluate the effects of subdivision where no subdivision is actually proposed.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R3: Rural industry and associated buildings and structures	Angela McFlynn	189.32	Amend	Considers that this RPROZ-R3: Rural industry and associated buildings and structures Rule as written requires restricted discretionary resource consent for any rural industry and associated buildings and structures on land that is not highly productive land.	Amend RPROZ-R3: Rural industry and associated buildings and structures as follows:  RPROZ-R3A  Activity Status: Permitted  Where:  1. The activity complies with all the Rural Production Zone Standards except RPROZ-S1 Yards, RPROZ-S4 Height, and RPROZ-S5 Building coverage; 2. Any outdoor storage associated must be screened from view of any adjacent sites and public open space; 3. Any building or structure must be a minimum of 15 m from any site boundary; 4. Any building or structure is no more than 15 m in height; 5. The maximum gross floor area of any building is 700m <sup>2</sup> , and 6. <del>The</del> <u>If the</u> activity is located within highly productive land, <u>it</u> <del>and</del> is a supporting activity.	Open Submission

# RPROZ - Rural Production Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R5: Residential activities and associated buildings and structures (excluding minor residential units)	Angela McFlynn	189.33	Amend	<p>Considers that the construction of one dwelling on a rural property to provide accommodation for the owner or farm manager is specifically anticipated by the NPS-HPL as a supporting activity. It is inappropriate to prevent the owner of a property from residing on their land, or where they reside elsewhere, providing on-site farm manager accommodation for security.</p> <p>The permitted size of buildings for supporting activities is appropriately controlled by Standard RPROZ-S5 – Building coverage.</p> <p>Note: if it is Council’s intention to adopt a district plan that is inconsistent with the NPS-HPL, the reference to “subdivision” should be removed from any evaluation report required to support an application for land use consent.</p>	<p>Amend RPROZ-R5: Residential activities and associated buildings and structures (excluding minor residential units) as follows:</p> <p>RPROZ-R5: Residential activities and associated buildings and structures (excluding minor residential units) RPROZ-R5A Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The activity complies with all of the Rural Production Zone Standards.</li> <li>2. One residential unit per site where the net site area of the site is larger than 2,500 m2.</li> <li><del>3. The activity is not located on highly productive land.</del></li> </ol> <p><del>RPROZ-R5B</del></p> <p><del>Activity Status where condition 3 is not met: Restricted-Discretionary</del></p> <p><del>Where:</del></p> <p><del>The activity is ancillary to land-based primary production activity within the same site. The application complies with RPROZ-R5B-REQ1.</del></p> <p><del>RPROZ-R5B-REQ1</del></p>	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R6: Minor residential unit	Angela McFlynn	189.34	Amend	<p>Considers a minor residential unit provides for supporting activities on the site.</p>	<p>Amend RPROZ-R6: Minor residential unit as follows:</p> <p>RPROZ-R6: Minor residential unit</p> <p>RPROZ-R6A Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The activity complies with all of the Rural Production Zone standards.</li> <li>2. One minor residential unit per site where the site is larger than 5,000 m2; and             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The minor residential residential unit is less than 80 m2 in gross floor area;</li> <li>b. The minor residential unit shares access with the primary residential unit onsite.</li> </ol> </li> <li><del>3. The activity is not located on Highly Productive Land.</del></li> </ol> <p><del>RPROZ-R6B</del></p> <p><del>Activity Status where condition RPROZ-R6A-3 is not met: Restricted discretionary</del></p> <p><del>Where:</del></p> <p><del>The activity is ancillary to the land-based primary production activity within the same site. The application complies with RPROZ-R6B-REQ1.</del></p> <p><del>RPROZ-R6B-REQ1</del></p> <p><del>Any application under rule RPROZ-R6A must include a productive-</del></p>	Open Submission

# RPROZ - Rural Production Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R10: Travellers' accommodation	Angela McFlynn	189.35	Amend	Considers the name of the Rule RPROZ-R10: Travellers' accommodation should be amended to "Visitor Accommodation" to be consistent with the definitions provided within the District Plan.Existing buildings should be able to be used for this purpose without the need to first obtain a resource consent.	Amend RPROZ-R10: Travellers' accommodation as follows:  RPROZ-R10: <del>Travellers</del> <u>Visitors</u> accommodation  <del>Activity Status: Non-complying</del>  RPROZ-R10A  Activity Status: <del>Non-Complying</del> <u>Permitted</u>  <u>Where:</u>  <u>1. The activity is being carried out within an existing residential building.</u>  <u>RPROZ-ROB</u>  <u>Activity Status where conditions are not met: Non-Complying</u>	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R12: Home business	Angela McFlynn	189.36	Amend	Considers that Home occupations are frequently carried out within an existing dwelling / accessory building. In this case it is irrelevant whether the existing building has been established on highly productive land, and this in itself should not be a trigger for requiring resource consent.	Seeks to amend RPROZ-R12: Home business as follows:  RPROZ-R12A  Activity Status: Permitted  <u>Where:</u>  1. The activity complies with all of the Rural Production Zone Standards; 2. The site must be occupied by a residential building and used for residential activities by the person or persons living on the site as their principal place of residence; 3. No more than three persons work on the site who reside outside the dwelling unit; 4. At all times, the home business must remain incidental and secondary to the use of any buildings for residential purposes; 5. The area of the home occupation must not exceed 30% of the gross floor area of the dwelling unit if located within the dwelling unit and/or 80 m2 if located in an accessory building; 6. Any external storage must be screened from view of any adjacent properties and public open space; 7. Retailing of goods must not occur from the site, and 8. The activity is not located on highly productive land, <u>or will be carried out within an existing building.</u>	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Standards Table /RPROZ-S3: Setback from highly productive land	Angela McFlynn	189.37	Oppose	Considers a 30m setback in RPROZ-S3: Setback from highly productive land from the boundary of any highly productive land is excessive, and not necessary protect against reverse sensitivity effects from residential activities. The setbacks required under standard RPROZ-S1 are sufficient. The setback should also relate only to highly productive land on an adjoining title. It is neither sensible nor practical to require a residential activity to be located 30m from highly productive land contained within the same property.	Delete RPROZ-S3: Setback from highly productive land in its entirety.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Policies /	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.53	Amend	There is no specific policy guidance in the rural zones for minor residential units. To ensure that these are appropriately managed to achieve the objectives for the rural zones including in relation to highly productive land and rural amenity, an additional policy is sought in terms of how minor residential units are approached.	Add a new policy "To enable appropriate Minor Household units in rural zones, where they provide for separate accommodation in a manner that is visually integrated with the Principal Household Unit." Or similar alternative relief.	Open Submission

# RPROZ - Rural Production Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R6: Minor residential unit	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.55	Amend	There is no requirement under the rules for minor residential units to be within close proximity to the principal residential unit. This could result in significant visual amenity and rural character effects, as well as resulting in further fragmentation of highly productive land including through provision of separate driveways etc.	Add new activity conditions for minor residential units (as a separate activity rule) as follows:  a) Sites less than 100ha The Minor Household Unit shall be separated from the Principal Household Unit by a maximum distance of 6 metres on all sites less than 100ha in rural zones.  b) Sites of 100 ha or greater The Minor Household Unit shall be separated from the Principal Household Unit by a maximum distance of 30 metres on all sites of 100ha or greater in rural zones.  Or similar alternative relief.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Assessment criteria /	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.57	Amend	There is currently no guidance in the rural zones for how to assess minor residential units that do not comply with the permitted activity standards. Matters of discretion and assessment criteria should provide guidance to ensure that these do not detract from the relevant objectives and policies for the zones.	Add matters of discretion and assessment criteria relating to rural character, external appearance, landform modification, density, visual impact, access, and highly productive land.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Policies /RPROZ-P3: Rural character and amenity	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.83	Amend	The wording of Policy RPROZ-P3(c) could be improved to assist in implementation.	Amend bullet point 3 as follows (or similar relief):  <del>buildings are generally integrated into a predominantly natural setting the rural environment.</del>	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.92	Amend	The NPS-HPL enables the continuation of existing activities on highly productive land through clause 3.11, provided any loss of productive land from those activities is minimised. This allows for the maintenance, operation or upgrade of activities that benefitted from existing use rights at the time the NPS-HPL commenced. The Rural Production Zone includes RPROZ-P1(b) to reflect this policy direction in the PDP. However, there are no specific rules relating to the maintenance, operation or upgrade of existing activities on highly productive land.	Add a new rule specifically enabling the maintenance, operation or upgrade of activities existing at the time the NPS-HPL commenced as a restricted discretionary activity to enable an assessment of the degree of loss of productive land  Or  Amend the activity status within existing rules for infringing the standard relating to highly productive land, providing a restricted discretionary activity status for the continuation of existing activities  Or similar relief to achieve the relevant policy direction of the NPS-HPL.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /General	Georgina McPherson	215.130	Oppose	Oppose the RPROZ rules as they do not provide for existing service stations activities, including any alterations or additions to the existing activity. Alterations or additions is a discretionary activity or a non-complying activity under rule RLZ-R8. This is overly restrictive with respect to existing activities. The Fuel Companies seek a new discretionary activity for service stations, subject to it being an addition, alteration or rebuild to that activity. In addition, a consequential change is needed to the definition of 'alteration or addition' as the current definition relates only to heritage buildings or structure.	Add new rule as follows:  <u>RPROZ-RX: Service stations Activity status: Discretionary</u>  Where:  <u>1. The activity is an addition, alteration or redevelopment of an existing service station.</u>	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Objectives /RPROZ-O1: Activities on highly productive land	Dominic Adams	221.9	Support	Objectives in the plan that protect primary production are important.	Seeks to retain the objective.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Objectives /RPROZ-O2: Activities on non-highly productive land	Dominic Adams	221.10	Support	Objectives in the plan that protect primary production and ancillary activities are important.	Retain the objective.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Objectives /RPROZ-O4: Reverse sensitivity	Dominic Adams	221.11	Support	It is important to protect primary production activities from reverse sensitivity effects.	Seeks to retain the objective.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Objectives /	Dominic Adams	221.12	Amend	Objectives in the plan should recognise activities that support primary production or have a functional need to be located in the RPROZ.	Seeks to Insert new objective:  <u>Non-primary production activities that support primary production or rely on a rural location or have a functional or operational need to locate in the Rural Production Zone are provided for.</u>	Open Submission

# RPROZ - Rural Production Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Policies /	Dominic Adams	221.13	Amend	Policies in the plan should enable activities that support primary production or have a functional need to be located in the RPROZ.	Seeks to Insert new policy: <u>Compatible activities.</u> <u>a. Enable primary production activities that are compatible with the purpose, character, and amenity values of the Rural Production Zone.</u> <u>b. Provide for other activities that have a functional need or operational need to be located in the Rural Production Zone that are not incompatible with primary production.</u>	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R1: Primary production activities outside highly productive land	Dominic Adams	221.14	Amend	It needs to be clear that ancillary activities to primary production are included in RPROZ-R1 otherwise RPROZ-R19 Noncomplying would apply as there is no other specific rule providing for ancillary activities to primary production.	Amend title to: Primary Production <u>and ancillary activities</u> outside highly productive land.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R2: Primary production activities within highly productive land.	Dominic Adams	221.15	Amend	It needs to be clear that ancillary activities to primary production are included in RPROZ-R2 otherwise RPROZ-R19 Noncomplying would apply as there is no other specific rule providing for ancillary activities to primary production.	Amend title to: Primary Production <u>and ancillary activities</u> within highly productive land.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R13: Relocated buildings	Sean Thompson	225.6	Amend	<p>Considers that it is not self-evident from the analysis and rationale in the proposed plan, including in terms of s 32 RMA, why relocated buildings should be classified as non-complying in the NCZ, LCZ, LFRZ, LIZ and GIZ. It is accepted that relocated buildings should be discretionary in the Natural Open Space Zone, and there may be urban design and other considerations applicable to the Town Centre Zone and City Centre Zone which warrant different treatment.</p> <p>Since a 2004 Central Otago Environment Court decision most local authorities in New Zealand have either adopted permitted activity classification for relocated buildings (with no standards) or provided for permitted activity status with prescribed performance standards.</p>	<p>Seeks to amend the relocated building activity PDP rules as follows:</p> <p>a. Provide for relocated buildings as a permitted activity (like RPROZ-R13) in all relevant zones, excepting where a specified heritage or conservation or urban design consideration applies;</p> <p>b. For the relocated building rules in all zones, the removal of the requirement to deposit a monitoring fee at the same time as submitting the relocated building report;</p> <p>c. Amending the performance standards in relation to relocated buildings in accordance with the wording in the attached Schedule 1 (which can be found in the attached submission), to provide for:</p> <p>i. modification of the performance timeframes such that relocation on permanent foundation is required within two months, and twelve months is allowed for the completion of all reinstatement works;</p> <p>ii. provision for a pre-inspection report in the same or similar form as found in Schedule 2 (which can be found in the attached submission).</p> <p>Consequential or further relief including to the relevant objectives, policies and provisions of the PDP in order to give effect to relief sought.</p> <p>(The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)</p>	Open Submission

# RPROZ - Rural Production Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Objectives /General	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.60	Amend	<p>Understand the importance of protecting the purpose of the zone, the rural character and productive soils from non-rural activities. However, the Ministry still has an obligation to provide educational support to rural communities. If any communities within the RPZ zone were to grow, they may require a new school or day care centre to provide for their social well-being. The Ministry only provides these educational facilities in rural zones if there is a demand for them. Rural educational facilities are often small in scale to cater for the small rural communities and to minimize the impact on amenity.</p> <p>The Ministry requests that a new objective is added to the RPROZ to acknowledge that some non-rural activities are required in rural zones to support those rural communities.</p> <p>The Ministry can also appreciate that council would likely prefer that educational facilities were located in nearby settlement zones.</p> <p>However, it is hard to predict how rural communities will change and grow over the next 10 years, and it is important that any zone that enables a residential community of some sort provides for educational facilities within the zoning provisions. This will enable the Ministry to</p> <p>continue to supply access to education for all of Napier.</p>	<p>Seeks to Amend RPROZ to add the following new objective:</p> <p><u>RPROZ-OX</u></p> <p><u>Non-Rural activities</u></p> <p><u>Non-rural activities align with the character and amenity of the Rural Production Zone and provide for the community's social, economic, and cultural wellbeing.</u></p>	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Policies /RPROZ-P6: Reverse sensitivity	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.61	Support	Supports RPROZ-P6 as it encourages sensitive activities (like educational facilities) to avoid locating in RPZ where possible. However, the wording does allow for the establishment of these facilities as long as the effects can be mitigated to prevent any reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R8: Day care centre	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.62	Oppose	Opposes RPROZ-R8 Childcare services are included within the definition of educational facilities. A separate activity status for daycare centres is not required and can be covered by PROZ-R9. Few other chapters have provided daycare centres is a separate activity status from educational facilities.	Seeks to delete RPROZ-R8.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R9: Education facility	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.63	Amend	<p>Considers that educational facilities should be provided for in the RPROZ as educational facilities are considered essential social infrastructure that may need to be located within rural areas to provide for the educational needs of rural communities.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Ministry acknowledges the potential effects and reverse sensitivity issues to be considered. The Ministry requests amendment of activity status to Discretionary for educational facilities in this zone.</p>	<p>Seeks to make the following amendment:</p> <p><u>Educational facility</u></p> <p>Activity Status: <del>Non-complying</del> <u>Discretionary</u></p>	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Introduction	Leanne Roberts	257.60	Amend	HortNZ supports the focus on primary production activities in the Rural Production Zone. But suggests a few minor wording changes would provide greater clarity.	<p>Seeks to amend RPROZ- Introduction to read:</p> <p>Para 3: Land uses that support <u>or are ancillary</u> to primary production and rural industry in the Rural Production Zone contribute to the economic wellbeing of the city and are provided for within the zone. Controls <u>are placed over unplanned</u> on rural lifestyle residential development, industrial and commercial activities and other inappropriate urban activities that do not support or are unrelated to the use of land for primary production.</p>	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Issues /RPROZ-11: The use of rural land for primary production provides economic opportunities	Leanne Roberts	257.61	Support	Considers the issues clearly articulate the role of horticulture in the rural zone.	Seeks to retain RPROZ-11.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Issues /RPROZ-12: The irreversible loss of versatile soils and highly productive land to urbanisation and inappropriate use and development	Leanne Roberts	257.62	Amend	While focus on versatile soils and highly productive land is supported, it should be acknowledged that all land in the Rural Production Zone is important for primary production.	<p>Seeks to amend RPROZ-12 to read:</p> <p>The irreversible loss of <u>rural production land, particularly</u> versatile soils and highly productive land, to urbanisation and inappropriate use and development</p>	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Issues /RPROZ-13: The life-supporting capacity of versatile soils and highly productive land is to be protected	Leanne Roberts	257.63	Support	Considers the protection of highly productive land is supported.	Seeks to retain RPROZ-13.	Open Submission

# RPROZ - Rural Production Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Issues /RPROZ-I4: Rural character and amenity can be undermined by increased development	Leanne Roberts	257.64	Amend	Considers the issue effectively describes the rural character of the rural area. The rural area is also characterised by activities that generate noise, odour or spray drift so this should be recognised as part of the rural character. Some horticultural structures such as artificial crop protection structures are also part of the rural character.	Seeks to amend RPROZ-I4 as follows:  Replace Para 2 as follows: <u>Rural character includes key elements of openness, vegetation and a primary production orientated working environment characterised with buildings and structures for primary production, shelterbelts, crops and pastures, trees and livestock</u>	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Issues /RPROZ-I5: Reverse sensitivity needs to be managed to ensure primary production activities can operate	Leanne Roberts	257.65	Amend	Considers reverse sensitivity needs to be managed so as to not constrain all primary production activities, not just 'land-based' primary production.	Seeks to amend RPROZ-I5 2nd sentence:  Reverse sensitivity need to be managed so as to not constrain <del>land-based</del> primary production activities, ...	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Objectives /RPROZ-O1: Activities on highly productive land	Leanne Roberts	257.66	Support	The objective gives effect to the NPSHPL.	Seeks to retains RPROZ-O1.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Objectives /RPROZ-O2: Activities on non-highly productive land	Leanne Roberts	257.67	Amend	Considers RPROZ-O2 should incorporate all land that is not highly productive – not just versatile soils.	Seeks to amend RPROZ-O2 as follows:  Land in the Rural Production Zone, including versatile soils, is retained for agriculture, horticulture and farming and used primarily for food production and ancillary activities that <u>support rely on</u> primary production	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Objectives /RPROZ-O3: Rural character and amenity	Leanne Roberts	257.68	Amend	Considers the focus should be on rural character as described in Issue 4. Natural features are addressed in the Natural features and landscapes chapter.	Seeks to amend, to make the intent clear in a rural setting:  <del>Natural features</del> , Rural character and amenity are not compromised by <del>adverse changes to landform</del> , intensification of non-rural land use and/or built form, or ad hoc urbanisation.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Objectives /RPROZ-O4: Reverse sensitivity	Leanne Roberts	257.69	Amend	The intent of the objective is supported however it would be better focused on primary production activities rather than 'rural activities' which is not defined.	Seeks to amend as follows:  Non-rural activities must support primary production and avoid or otherwise mitigate reverse sensitivity effects that may compromise <del>rural</del> primary production activities.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Objectives /RPROZ-O5: Cumulative effects	Leanne Roberts	257.70	Amend	The intent of the objective is supported however it would be better focused on all land for primary production.	Seeks to amend as follows:  Subdivision, use or development do not have cumulative effects that deplete the availability and productive capacity <u>of land for primary production, including</u> highly productive land or natural resources.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Policies /RPROZ-P1: Use or development of highly productive land	Leanne Roberts	257.71	Amend	Considers the policy needs to more accurately reflect the NPSHPL.	Seeks to amend RPROZ-P1 as follows:  Amend c) by deleting subpoints ii, iii, and iv as these are included in Section 3.10 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Policies /RPROZ-P2: Rural land use outside of highly productive land	Leanne Roberts	257.72	Amend	Considers the focus shouldn't only be on versatile land but rather all land that isn't highly productive land.	Seeks to amend RPROZ-P2 to read:  Primary production activities continue to have access to <u>land, including versatile land by:</u>	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Policies /RPROZ-P3: Rural character and amenity	Leanne Roberts	257.73	Amend	Considers it is important to provide a realistic and clear expectation of rural character/amenity.	Seeks to retain a policy addressing rural character and amenity, but amend to also include features that are inherent such as:  · Ancillary activities and structures (including crop support and crop protection structures) across the landscape  · Odours, noise and dust typical of rural activities  · Varying levels of noise associated with seasonal and intermittent rural production activities.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Policies /RPROZ-P4: Services and infrastructure	Leanne Roberts	257.74	Amend	Considers it is not a district council function to manage discharges. This should be deleted from the policy.	Delete: 'from discharges'.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Policies /RPROZ-P5: Protection of rural values	Leanne Roberts	257.75	Amend	The policy is based on a set of 'rural values'. These should only be applied to non-primary production activities that may locate in the Rural Production Zone.	Seeks to amend RPROZ-P5:  <u>Non-primary production</u> use and development do not degrade the values associated with the Rural Production Zone.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Policies /RPROZ-P6: Reverse sensitivity	Leanne Roberts	257.76	Amend	Land based primary production activities are a subset of primary production so do not need to be specifically included.	Seeks to delete:  and land based primary production activities.	Open Submission

# RPROZ - Rural Production Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Policies /RPROZ-P7: Cumulative effects	Leanne Roberts	257.77	Support	Retaining highly productive land and versatile soils is supported.	Seeks to retain RPROZ-P7	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R1: Primary production activities outside highly productive land	Leanne Roberts	257.78	Amend	A permitted activity is supported in RPROZ-R1A, including for buildings and structures.  However, considers the matters of discretion in RPROZ-R1B (7) should just refer to rural character.	Seeks to amend RPROZ-R1B (7) by deleting 'open'.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R2: Primary production activities within highly productive land	Leanne Roberts	257.79	Amend	Considers RPROZ-R3A Clause 6 could be better worded in respect to being a supporting activity on highly productive land.	Seeks to amend RPROZ-R3A clause 6: <u>The activity is a supporting activity if located on highly productive land.</u>	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R4: Rural produce retail activity	Leanne Roberts	257.80	Amend	The intent of the rule is supported however it is considered that clause 4 should allow for produce grown on the same site or by the same operation – which may grow on a number of locations in the city.	Seeks to amend RPROZ-R4A 4) by adding: <u>or by the same operation</u>	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R5: Residential activities and associated buildings and structures (excluding minor residential units)	Leanne Roberts	257.81	Amend	Considers there should be provision for a residential unit on a property that has highly productive land so that the property can be appropriately managed.  A productive capacity assessment should not be required for residential activity on highly productive land.	Seeks to amend RPROZ-R5A (3): <u>The activity is a principal residential unit on highly productive land</u>  Delete RPROZ-R5B REQ1	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R6: Minor residential unit	Leanne Roberts	257.82	Amend	Considers There should be provision for a minor residential unit on a property that has highly productive land so that the property can be appropriately managed.  A productive capacity assessment should not be required for minor residential unit on highly productive land.	Seeks to amend RPROZ-R6A (3) <u>The activity is a minor residential unit on highly productive land ancillary to primary production activities.</u>  Delete RPROZ-R6B REQ1	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R7: Residential care facility	Leanne Roberts	257.83	Support	A non-complying activity status is supported.	Seeks to retain RPROZ-R7 Residential care facility.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R8: Day care centreActivity Status: Non-complying NA	Leanne Roberts	257.84	Support	A non-complying activity status is supported.	Seeks to retain RPROZ-R8 Day care centre.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R9: Education facilityActivity Status: Non-complying NA	Leanne Roberts	257.85	Support	A non-complying activity status is supported.	Seeks to retain RPROZ-R9 Education facility.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R10: Travellers' accommodation	Leanne Roberts	257.86	Amend	A non-complying activity status is supportedHowever, the activity should be visitors accommodation.	Seeks to retain RPROZ-R10 but amend to be visitors accommodation.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R11: Seasonal workers' accommodation	Leanne Roberts	257.87	Amend	The permitted activity rule for seasonal worker accommodation is supported. However, it should not be limited to land based primary production.	Seeks to amend RPROZ-R11A (6) by deleting 'land based.'	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Standards Table /RPROZ-S1: Yards	Leanne Roberts	257.88	Amend	Seeks that side and rear yards for residential activities be 30m from the boundary to provide an adequate separation to manage reverse sensitivity effects.	Seeks yo amend RPROZ-S1 2) by adding  Residential activities shall be no closer than 30m from the side or rear boundary.  Artificial crop protection structures shall be no closer than 3 m from a side or rear boundary.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Standards Table /RPROZ-S2: Setback from water, open drains, and stopbanks	Leanne Roberts	257.89	Amend	Considers there needs to be provisions for structures such as pump sheds which need to locate near the water source.	Seeks to amend RPROZ-S2 to provide exemption for pump sheds.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Standards Table /RPROZ-S3: Setback from highly productive land	Leanne Roberts	257.90	Amend	HortNZ seeks that a setback of 30m apply to all residential activity near primary production activities, not just on highly productive land.	Seeks to amend RPROZ-S1 so that a setback of 30m applies to all residential activity near primary production activities, not just on highly productive land.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Standards Table /RPROZ-S4: Height	Leanne Roberts	257.91	Amend	Considers the height provisions do not adequately provide for frost fans.	Seeks to amend RPROZ-S3 by adding: <u>4) frost fans measure to the tip of the blade shall not exceed 15m.</u>	Open Submission



# RPROZ - Rural Production Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Standards Table /RPROZ-S5: Building coverage	Leanne Roberts	257.92	Amend	Considers building coverage should not apply to artificial crop protection structures or greenhouses.	Seeks to amend Note in RPROZ-S5:  2. Netting, structures (including artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures), and greenhouses <del>where crops are grown under or within those structures directly in the soil of the site</del> , are excluded from total building coverage calculations.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Standards Table /RPROZ-S8: Shelterbelts and plantations	Leanne Roberts	257.93	Support	Supports shelterbelts not exceeding 9m to be planted within 5m of a site boundary.	Seeks to retain RPROZ-S8 Shelterbelts and plantations.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Standards Table /General	Leanne Roberts	257.94	Amend	This links to the noise controls for frost protection fans, that reverse sensitivity effects are avoided where possible.	Seeks to include a standard, that applied to new noise sensitive activities in the RPROZ, that requires insulation in bedrooms to a level of 35dB LAeq if within 300m of an existing frost protection fan.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Assessment criteria /RPROZ-AC1: All infringementsThe assessment criteria in RPROZ-AC1 apply in addition to those in RPROZ-AC2 to RPROZ-AC5.	Leanne Roberts	257.95	Amend	Suggesting edits to be clearer and more consistent with terminology used in the plan.	Seeks to amend RPROZ-AC1  e) by deleting 'land based'  f) Delete 'streetscape'  Delete rural activities and amend rural production to primary production	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Assessment criteria /RPROZ-AC2: Rural activities	Leanne Roberts	257.96	Amend	Rural activities is not defined.	Seeks to rename RPROZ AC2 Non-Primary production activities.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Issues /RPROZ-I8: Providing infrastructure to support non-rural uses would place unsustainable pressure on Council resources	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.126	Support	Supports this issue to ensure that the correct infrastructure is in place to support intensified development.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /Policies /RPROZ-P7: Cumulative effects	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.127	Amend	Supports in part policy RPROZ-P7. Seeks for Council to broaden this policy to ensure cumulative development does not compromise the safety, efficiency and function of the road by creating a significant increase in accesses to the state highway.	Amend as follows: RPROZ-P7: Cumulative Effects To ensure that the cumulative adverse effects of subdivision, use and development of land do not deplete the versatile land, other natural resources, natural features, or significant landscapes, <u>or the safety, efficiency and function of the transport infrastructure.</u>	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /RPROZ-R5: Residential activities and associated buildings and structures (excluding minor residential units)	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.128	Oppose	Opposed as submitter is concerned that this rule permits multiple activities on a single site. Considers that cumulative development of a site could result in high trip generation and compromise the safety, efficiency and function on the region's rural state highways.	Clarify if the intent of rule is to allow cumulative development that could create high trip generation.	Open Submission
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Rules Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.63	Amend	Fire and Emergency requires the ability to construct and operate emergency service facilities (i.e., fire stations) in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies. This means new fire stations may be necessary in any zone across the district in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations.  Fire and Emergency notes that the effects of a fire station can be largely anticipated and, in the most part, do not differ to the effects of many activities that may be anticipated through rural and urban environments.  Fire and Emergency requests that emergency service facilities are provided for as permitted activities in the larger, more extensive zones of the district to recognise the critical importance of emergency services to communities. In providing for emergency service facility as a permitted activity would mean that emergency service facilities would be controlled by the subsequent performance standards of each zone (such as height, height in relation to boundary, front yards, building coverage requirements).and the other relevant performance standards in other chapters (i.e., transport) to ensure that any effects are appropriately managed.	Seeks to include new permitted activity as follows: <u>xxx-Rx: Emergency service facilities</u>  <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u>  <u>N/A</u>  Or  To similar effect.  And  any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.	Open Submission

# RPROZ - Rural Production Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RPROZ - Rural Production Zone /RPROZ - Rural Production Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.82	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency’s main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</p> <p>SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.</p> <p>In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure and that new connections under the water supply</p>	<p>Seeks to include a new performance standard as follows:</p> <p><u>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</u></p> <p>1. <u>All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u></p> <p>2. <u>Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p><u>Matter of discretion:</u></p> <p>1. <u>The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to</p>	Open Submission

# SETZ - Settlement zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SETZ - Settlement zone /SETZ - Settlement Zone - Standards Table	Susan Dallas	25.22	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
SETZ - Settlement zone /SETZ - Settlement Zone - Standards Table	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.22	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
SETZ - Settlement zone /SETZ - Settlement Zone - Rules Table	Angela McFlynn	189.52	Amend	The submitter considers that the use of existing residential buildings for visitor accommodation should be a permitted activity.	Amend the SETZ - Settlement Zone - Rules Table with a new Rule as follows:  <u>SETZ-RX: Visitor Accommodation</u>  <u>SETZ-RXA</u>  <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u>  <u>Where:</u>  <u>The activity is being carried out within an existing residential building.</u>	Open Submission
SETZ - Settlement zone /SETZ - Settlement Zone - Standards Table	Angela McFlynn	189.53	Oppose	Considers a 30m setback from the boundary of any land within the Rural Productive Zone comprising highly productive land is excessive, and [not won't] necessary protect against reverse sensitivity effects from residential activities.	Delete SETZ-S3: Setback from highly productive land in its entirety.	Open Submission
SETZ - Settlement zone /SETZ - Settlement Zone - Standards Table	Angela McFlynn	189.54	Oppose	Considers a 30m setback from the boundary of any land-based primary production activity is excessive, and [not won't] necessary protect against reverse sensitivity effects from residential activities.	Delete SETZ-S4: Setback from land-based primary production in its entirety as notified.	Open Submission
SETZ - Settlement zone /SETZ - Settlement Zone - Standards Table	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.13	Amend	The density rule does not recognize unserviced sites. The rule also is more restrictive than the Operative District Plan rule for fully serviced sites, however this change has not been supported by analysis.	Either undertake further analysis for change to density provisions from the ODP, or, amend to allow for:  - Fully serviced sites: One residential unit per site, provided that the net site area is not less than 800sqm, - Other sites:  a) One residential unit per site, provided that the net site area is not less than 1000sqm  b) One residential unit and one minor residential unit per site, provided that the net site area is not less than 2000sqm.	Open Submission
SETZ - Settlement zone /Policies /SETZ-P2: Retain settlement character and amenity	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.84	Amend	The wording of Policy SETZ-P29(b) could be improved to assist in implementation.	Amend bullet point 3 as follows (or similar relief):  buildings are <del>generally</del> integrated into a <del>predominantly natural</del> <u>setting the rural environment</u> ,	Open Submission
SETZ - Settlement zone /Policies /SETZ-P6: Cumulative effects	Anna and Ben Sanders	207.2	Oppose	Opposes the zoning of Jervoistown as a Precinct and considers this to be an ineffective mechanism to use to signal and account for potential suitability for greater or more residential intensification. Considers the proposed Plan is not enabling more intensive residential development by way of the proposed plan provisions, it is simply signalling it, with no subdivision standards included should the key identified infrastructure occur. If the infrastructure is to occur there is a need for development agreements with multiple landowners, and a following plan change to introduce an effect's based subdivision minimum. Submits all of which is sought to be achieved can be done more simply and if the Precinct remains, needs to be undertaken in meaningful engagement with current property owners.	Amendments to the Settlement Zone (SETZ) and Jervoistown Precinct (PREC4)	Open Submission

# SETZ - Settlement zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SETZ - Settlement zone /SETZ - Settlement Zone - Standards Table	Mike Doesburg	209.3	Oppose	Opposes the density standard of one dwelling per 1000m2 in the Settlement Zone for the reasons set out in the submission.	Amend SETZ-S1 as follows:  1. Where a site is fully serviced with council-reticulated networks, the maximum density must not exceed: a. one dwelling per <del>1000</del> 350 m2, and b. one dwelling unit and one minor residential unit per site, provided that the net site area is not less than 1500 m2.	Open Submission
SETZ - Settlement zone /SETZ - Settlement Zone - Rules Table	Mike Doesburg	209.5	Amend	Considers that the Settlement Zone should provide for retirement villages, specifically at 68 Franklin Road.	Amend the Settlement Zone Chapter to include a new rule as a restricted discretionary activity for the establishment of retirement villages.	Open Submission
SETZ - Settlement zone /Objectives /SETZ-O5: Reverse sensitivity	Georgina McPherson	215.131	Support	The Fuel Companies are supportive of provisions for reverse sensitivity.	Retain SETZ-O5 and SETZ-P5 as notified.	Open Submission
SETZ - Settlement zone /Policies /SETZ-P5: Reverse sensitivity	Georgina McPherson	215.132	Support	The Fuel Companies are supportive of provisions for reverse sensitivity.	Retain SETZ-O5 and SETZ-P5 as notified.	Open Submission
SETZ - Settlement zone /Assessment criteria /SETZ-AC2: All activities	Georgina McPherson	215.133	Amend	The Fuel Companies support the inclusion of Reverse Sensitivities as assessment criteria. However, they seek that the criteria are expanded beyond reverse sensitivity effects on airport operations and activities.	Amend SETZ-AC2 Reverse sensitivities as follows:  az. Whether the location of the site in relation to the airport and the airport noise boundary and the likely exposure to airport noise will lead to an unreasonable level of amenity for sensitive land uses or future occupiers.  ba. Whether in the circumstances, (including the number of people to be accommodated), the nature, size, and scale of the development are such that it is likely to lead to potential conflict with and adverse effects on airport activities, or whether the proposed activity might constrain the way in which the airport operates.  bb. The extent to which the establishment of activities may over time demand increasingly higher levels of amenity and where such expectations may unduly restrict accepted management practices of normal airport operations.  <u>bc. Whether the development is likely to lead to potential conflict with or adverse effects on established non-residential activities in adjoining zones.</u>	Open Submission

# SETZ - Settlement zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SETZ - Settlement zone /SETZ - Settlement Zone - Rules Table	Sean Thompson	225.7	Amend	<p>Considers that it is not self-evident from the analysis and rationale in the proposed plan, including in terms of s 32 RMA, why relocated buildings should be classified as non-complying in the NCZ, LCZ, LFRZ, LIZ and GIZ. It is accepted that relocated buildings should be discretionary in the Natural Open Space Zone, and there may be urban design and other considerations applicable to the Town Centre Zone and City Centre Zone which warrant different treatment.</p> <p>Since a 2004 Central Otago Environment Court decision most local authorities in New Zealand have either adopted permitted activity classification for relocated buildings (with no standards) or provided for permitted activity status with prescribed performance standards.</p>	<p>The Association seeks to amend the relocated building activity PDP rules as follows:</p> <p>a. Provide for relocated buildings as a permitted activity (like SETZ-R6) in all relevant zones, excepting where a specified heritage or conservation or urban design consideration applies;</p> <p>b. For the relocated building rules in all zones, the removal of the requirement to deposit a monitoring fee at the same time as submitting the relocated building report;</p> <p>c. Amending the performance standards in relation to relocated buildings in accordance with the wording in the attached Schedule 1 (which can be found in the attached submission), to provide for:</p> <p>i. modification of the performance timeframes such that relocation on permanent foundation is required within two months, and twelve months is allowed for the completion of all reinstatement works;</p> <p>ii. provision for a pre-inspection report in the same or similar form as found in Schedule 2 (which can be found in the attached submission).</p> <p>Consequential or further relief including to the relevant objectives, policies and provisions of the proposed plan in order to give effect to relief sought.</p> <p>(The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)</p>	Open Submission
SETZ - Settlement zone /Objectives /General	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.64	Amend	<p>Considers the RPROZ objectives do not sufficiently provide for educational facilities. Considers that educational facilities, particularly early childhood centres and schools, should be enabled where there is a residential population. The Ministry supports amending SETZ to include a new objective taken from MRZ-o2 to allow development activities if they contribute to social well-being. The ministry considers that educational facilities support social well-being. States the adoption of this objective would align with part 2 section 5(2) of the RMA, it would provide local communities with essential social infrastructure to service the residential catchment in rural areas.</p>	<p>Seeks to Amend SETZ to add the following objective:</p> <p><u>SETZ-OX</u></p> <p><b>Community wellbeing</b></p> <p><u>Development and activities contribute to safety, security, social wellbeing, and connectivity in communities.</u></p>	Open Submission
SETZ - Settlement zone /Policies /General	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.65	Amend	<p>Considers that educational facilities particularly early childhood centres and schools, should be provided for in the SETZ as educational facilities should be provided in any zone that enables residential development. To achieve best planning outcomes educational facilities should be represented in the objectives and policies as well as it's own rules framework. Although the Ministry use the Notice of Requirement process for it's school sites, in the Ministry's experience the objectives and policies of the zone are important provisions used to assess the NoRs.</p> <p>The Ministry request that SETZ is amended to add an additional provision is included that enables non-residential activities (like educational facilities) if they support the community needs and wellbeing. This will allow the Ministry to provided schools for the community and better respond to growth over time.</p>	<p>Seeks to Amend SETZ to add the following objective:</p> <p><b>Non-residential activities</b></p> <p><u>Limit Non-residential activities in the zone to:</u></p> <p>a. <u>prioritise efficient use of the zone for residential activities;</u></p> <p>b. <u>minimise effects on the vitality of centre zones, and</u></p> <p>c. <u>minimise effects on residential amenity</u></p> <p>d. <u>only those required to support well-functioning urban environments.</u></p>	Open Submission

# SETZ - Settlement zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SETZ - Settlement zone /SETZ - Settlement Zone - Rules Table /General	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.66	Amend	<p>Considers educational facilities are currently not provided for under the plan but rather fall under the proposed rule SETZ-R4 as a Discretionary activity.</p> <p>The Ministry acknowledges that the primary purpose of the settlement zone is to provide for a cluster of residential, commercial, light industrial, and/or community activities located in rural areas or coastal environments.</p> <p>The Ministry considers that educational facilities, particularly early childhood centres and schools, should be provided for where there is potential for a population to support them including in the settlement zone. They are typical in small settlements and should be enabled in this zone as educational facilities are considered essential social infrastructure. The Ministry therefore requests the following new policy educational facilities in the Rural Zone.</p> <p>The matters of discretion proposed, have been taken from other chapters in the Plan. However, if council does not support these, the Ministry would appreciate the opportunity to work with council to come to an agreement on these matters of discretion.</p>	<p>Seeks to Amend SETZ to add the following provision:</p> <p><u>SETZ-RX</u></p> <p><b>Educational Facility</b></p> <p><u>Activity Status:</u> Restricted Discretionary</p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Scale, design, layout, setbacks and screening;</u></li> <li>2. <u>Reverse sensitivity on surrounding properties</u></li> <li>3. <u>Contribution to local community wellbeing;</u></li> <li>4. <u>Effects on the streetscape and rural/settlement character;</u></li> </ol>	Open Submission
SETZ - Settlement zone /Issues /SETZ-I3: The cumulative effects of residential subdivision and development in the rural settlement zone place unsustainable pressure on council infrastructure	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.129	Amend	Support in part this issue as it identifies cumulative effects of development on infrastructure but consider that NZTA infrastructure should be included also or remove the word council, so it covers all infrastructure	The cumulative effects of residential subdivision and development in the rural settlement zone place unsustainable pressure on council infrastructure. (Inferred removed of the word Council; The cumulative effects of residential subdivision and development in the rural settlement zone place unsustainable pressure on <del>council</del> infrastructure.)	Open Submission
SETZ - Settlement zone /Issues /SETZ-I4: The potential for reverse sensitivity in rural environments	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.130	Amend	Supports I4 but there is a settlement zone identified in close proximity State Highway 50 and 2 and consider that reverse sensitivity effects should also be considered for the state highway network	<p>Amend to below:</p> <p><u>There is the potential for reverse sensitivity effects where conflicts arise between existing rural land uses, transport networks and neighbouring residential-focused rural settlements.</u></p>	Open Submission
SETZ - Settlement zone /Objectives /General	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.131	Amend	Considers that since there is a settlement zone identified in close proximity to State Highway 50 and 2 reverse sensitivity from the existing use of the state highway should also be considered	<p>New objective:</p> <p><u>State Highway activities are not unreasonably compromised by reverse sensitivity effects and/or incompatible activities locating in a Settlement Zone.</u></p>	Open Submission
SETZ - Settlement zone /Policies /SETZ-P6: Cumulative effects	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.132	Support	Support P6 as it ensures the effects of subdivision, use and development of land does not compromise the ability of infrastructure to perform efficiently.	Retain as notified	Open Submission
SETZ - Settlement zone /Policies /General	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.133	Amend	Considers that since there are settlement zones identified in close proximity to State Highway 50 and 2 reverse sensitivity from the existing use of the state highway should also be considered.	<p>New policy:</p> <p><u>Ensure that existing state highway activities are not compromised by reverse sensitivity effects and/or incompatible activities located in an adjacent Settlement Zone.</u></p>	Open Submission
SETZ - Settlement zone /SETZ - Settlement Zone - Standards Table /General	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.134	Amend	Considers that since there are settlement zones identified in close proximity to State Highway 50 and 2 reverse sensitivity from the existing use of the state highway should also be considered.	<p>Include New standard:</p> <p><u>Setback from state highways</u></p> <p><u>No residential activity is located closer than 100m from a state highway</u></p>	Open Submission

# SETZ - Settlement zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SETZ - Settlement zone /SETZ - Settlement Zone - Rules Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.64	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency requires the ability to construct and operate emergency service facilities (i.e., fire stations) in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies. This means new fire stations may be necessary in any zone across the district in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the effects of a fire station can be largely anticipated and, in the most part, do not differ to the effects of many activities that may be anticipated through rural and urban environments.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency requests that emergency service facilities are provided for as permitted activities in the larger, more extensive zones of the district to recognise the critical importance of emergency services to communities. In providing for emergency service facility as a permitted activity would mean that emergency service facilities would be controlled by the subsequent performance standards of each zone (such as height, height in relation to boundary, front yards, building coverage requirements).and the other relevant performance standards in other chapters (i.e., transport) to ensure that any effects are appropriately managed.</p>	<p>Seeks to include new permitted activity as follows:</p> <p><b>xxx-Rx: Emergency services facilities</b>  <b>Activity status:</b> Permitted</p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.</p>	Open Submission
SETZ - Settlement zone /SETZ - Settlement Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.83	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency's main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</p> <p>SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB-S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.</p> <p>In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and</p>	<p>Seeks to include a new performance standard as follows:</p> <p><b>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</b></p> <p><u>1. All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u></p> <p><u>2. Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p><u>Matter of discretion:</u></p> <p><u>1. The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.</p>	Open Submission
SETZ - Settlement zone /Policies /SETZ-P3: Require sites to be of a sufficient size to cater for water supply, wastewater, and stormwater servicing on site	Alec Duncan	288.129	Support	<p>Supports SETZ-P3 insofar as it requires sites to be of a sufficient size to cater for on-site water supply infrastructure. This supports the new performance standard sought above in relation to firefighting water supply provision.</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
SETZ - Settlement zone /SETZ - Settlement Zone - Standards Table	Alec Duncan	288.130	Amend	<p>Seeks the inclusion of a new matter of discretion to provide NCC the ability to consider the risk of non-compliance with SETZ-S2 on emergency service access. It is important that emergency service access suitable for Fire and Emergency personnel is provided at site boundaries, as well as provision for emergency egress by residents.</p>	<p>Add a new matter of discretion to SETZ-S2 as follows:</p> <p><u>14. The ability for emergency services to safely and efficient access the site.</u></p>	Open Submission

# RCA - Rural Specific Control Area

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
RCA - Rural Specific Control Area /Policies /RCA-P5: Discourage development and uses that cause irreversible damage. Relates to RCA-O1, RCA-O2, RCA-O3, and RCA-O5	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.180	Amend	Considers the word “discourage” is inappropriately vague in this context.	Amend to: “ <del>Discourage</del> <u>Prohibit</u> development and uses that cause irreversible damage”	Open Submission
RCA - Rural Specific Control Area /General /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.181	Oppose	Whole chapter, including Introduction, Objectives, Policies and Rules  Arising from late notification of ECO-chapter.	Seeks to add: “The Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter includes provisions which relate to the Rural Specific Control Area. Where there is a conflict between the Rural Specific Control Area chapter and the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter, the provisions that place greater or additional restrictions on activities with adverse effects on the natural environment will apply”.	Open Submission



# PREC4 - Jervoistown Precinct

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PREC4 - Jervoistown Precinct /PREC4 - Jervoistown Precinct - Standards Table	Susan Dallas	25.23	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
PREC4 - Jervoistown Precinct /PREC4 - Jervoistown Precinct - Standards Table	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.23	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
PREC4 - Jervoistown Precinct /PREC4 - Jervoistown Precinct /	Deborah Burnside	147.2	Amend	Seeks to address the lack of infrastructure in Jervoistown - open drains, no footpaths or street lighting, lack of wastewater servicing, given the increase in more developments in the area.	Address lack of infrastructure in Jervoistown. Review impact of septic tanks on drainage during heavy rain. Clear drains more frequently. Review impact of BUPA retirement village closing in drain. Provide lighting and footpaths.	Open Submission
PREC4 - Jervoistown Precinct /Objectives /PREC4-O2: Inappropriate subdivisions, use and development	Anna and Ben Sanders	207.1	Amend	Opposes the zoning of Jervoistown as a Precinct (PREC4) and considers this to be an ineffective mechanism to use to signal and account for potential suitability for greater or more residential intensification. Considers the proposed Plan is not enabling more intensive residential development by way of the proposed plan provisions, it is simply signalling it, with no subdivision standards included should the key identified infrastructure occur. If the infrastructure is to occur there is a need for development agreements with multiple landowners, and a following plan change to introduce an effects based subdivision minimum. The submitter considers that all of which is sought to be achieved can be done more simply and if the Precinct remains, needs to be undertaken in meaningful engagement with current property owners.	Amend the Settlement Zone (SETZ) and Jervoistown Precinct (PREC4) following consultation with tangible resulting provisions via a Plan Change that includes a subdivision minimum size in order to actually enable more intensive residential development rather than just signalling it as is currently the case.	Open Submission
PREC4 - Jervoistown Precinct /Objectives /General	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.67	Amend	Considers the establishment of any educational facilities necessary within the Jervoistown Precinct to contribute to social well-being. This small rural community enabled by this precinct may need the support of day care centres or a small school. this should be reflected with the provisions.	Seeks to Amend to include community well-being to the objectives:  <b>Community wellbeing</b>  <u>Development and activities contribute to safety, security, social wellbeing, and connectivity in communities.</u>	Open Submission
PREC4 - Jervoistown Precinct /PREC4 - Jervoistown Precinct - Rules	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.68	Amend	Does not support educational facilities as a discretionary activity. States educational facilities should be provided for as a restricted discretionary activity to enable daycare centres or small schools to support the small community enabled by Jervoistown Precinct. Effects can be well managed through appropriate matters of discretion.  The matters of discretion proposed have been taken from other chapters in the plan, if council does not support these, the ministry would appreciate the opportunity to work with council to come to an agreement on these matters of discretion.	Seeks to make the following amendments:  <b>Retirement complexes, residential care facilities, day care centres, travellers' accommodation, educational facilities</b>  <b>Activity Status:</b> Discretionary  <b>Educational facilities</b>  <b>Activity Status:</b> <del>Discretionary</del> <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u>  <u>1. Scale, design, layout, setbacks and screening;</u> <u>2. Reverse sensitivity on surrounding properties</u> <u>3. Contribution to local community wellbeing;</u> <u>4. Effects on the streetscape and rural/settlement character;</u>	Open Submission
PREC4 - Jervoistown Precinct /PREC4 - Jervoistown Precinct /Introduction	Vanessa Moon	282.1	Oppose	Submitter provides background to submission including that the submitter was unaware of the plan to change the Jervoistown Zone (JZP) to a Jervoistown Precinct Plan (JPP) in the Draft District Plan (DDP) consulted on in 2021. Considers that the lack of awareness likely favored individuals "in the know," such as local developers, potentially excluding resident input. Notes the challenges navigating the information in the PDP and comparing the JZP with the JPP layouts, exacerbated by unfamiliarity with the legal aspects of a District Plan. Refer to original submission for full reasons.	Seeks that the change in the status of Jervoistown from the existing Jervoistown Zone to the proposed Jervoistown precinct be on hold until such time as the current Jervoistown community members have been consulted on alternative options for the future of Jervoistown as indicated in submission. Refer to original submission for full reasons.	Open Submission

# PREC4 - Jervoistown Precinct

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PREC4 - Jervoistown Precinct /PREC4 - Jervoistown Precinct - Rules	Vanessa Moon	282.2	Support	Supports the Rules included in the JPP insofar as they are the same as those in the JZP.	Seeks that the change in the status of Jervoistown from the existing Jervoistown Zone to the proposed Jervoistown precinct be on hold until such time as the current Jervoistown community members have been consulted on alternative options for the future of Jervoistown as indicated in my submission.	Open Submission
PREC4 - Jervoistown Precinct /PREC4 - Jervoistown Precinct - Rules	Vanessa Moon	282.3	Oppose	<p>Opposes proposed change made in the JPP for subdivision of properties of less than 2,500 square metres to be moved from a "Prohibited Activity" to a "Non-complying Activity", with the ultimate goal of Jervoistown becoming another NCC serviced suburb. Considers that there has been a lack of meaningful consultation with Jervoistown community since 2013. Notes the increased awareness of climate change, biodiversity loss, food security, and water issues. Considers that there is a need for wider consideration of Jervoistown's future beyond more subdivision, more houses, less green space and trees/plants, more asphalt, concrete and pipes. Acknowledges the need for more (smaller/more eco friendly) housing in Napier, and considers that Jervoistown provides opportunity to enhance green space, biodiversity, innovative water management, and local food production.</p> <p>Notes the benefits for mental health and community cohesion. Considers that this approach would also build a stronger community able to support one another and, therefore, to provide support to those in other communities in Napier too and also add to the overall "green/blue" space in the city that residents from elsewhere can enjoy when they are out walking or cycling. Notes the potential for further environmental initiatives like streamside plantings and recognises "Friends Bush" as a Significant Natural Area in Jervoistown. Refer to original submission for full reasons.</p>	<p>Submitter proposes the following options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Implementing a system of open stormwater ditches to increase stormwater holding capacity in Jervoistown, potentially planted with appropriate vegetation for water filtration.</li> <li>- Creating detention tanks with wetland plantings, possibly utilizing undeveloped sections like Napier Street.</li> <li>- Replacing asphalt roads with permeable surfaces and lowering speed limits to 40 kph within Jervoistown.</li> <li>- Encouraging property owners to install retention tanks, soak pits, replace hard surfaces with landscaped areas, and plant gardens with native and exotic plants for cooling, flood mitigation, and biodiversity.</li> <li>- Considering locations for community gardens and urban farms in Jervoistown.</li> <li>- Exploring alternative waste management methods, such as composting toilets, with a system for composting waste and utilizing resulting products for agricultural purposes.</li> </ul> <p>Notes their vision for Jervoistown: Foster community, biodiversity, climate-resilient water management, green Napier, and local food source. No specific relief sought. Refer to original submission for full details.</p>	Open Submission

# PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct /PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct - Rules Table /PREC5-R3: Concert and entertainment events (including associated buildings and structures)	Peter Holley	234.1	Amend	Considers that PREC5-R3A (2) should be amended so that there is the opportunity to host smaller events at the venue, in addition to the 5 significant events, with an appropriate number of 12,000 people.	Amend PREC5-R3A (2) as follows:  2. The number of concert and entertainment events that may occur in a calendar year must not exceed five <u>significant events with attendances of greater than 12,000 people.</u>	Open Submission
PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct /PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct - Rules Table /PREC5-R3: Concert and entertainment events (including associated buildings and structures)	Peter Holley	234.2	Amend	Amend PREC5-R3(3) the setup of major concerts can take 2 - 3 weeks and an additional week required for pack down. This process has no significant adverse effects on neighbours, so therefore seeks the process is not restricted by the event duration condition.	Seeks to amend PREC5-R3(3) as follows:  3. The duration of the event must not exceed a period of 24 hours for <u>attended concerts and events. For the avoidance of doubt, the set up and pack up time is not restricted by this condition.</u>	Open Submission
PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct /PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct - Rules Table /PREC5-R3: Concert and entertainment events (including associated buildings and structures)	Peter Holley	234.3	Amend	There have been times where concerts have been held on public holidays which have not fallen on a weekend, making it reasonable that the hours of noise that apply to Fridays and Saturdays should also apply to public holidays.	Seeks to Amend PREC5-R3(4) to allow for public holidays to have the same amplified noise hours as Fridays and Saturdays.	Open Submission
PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct /PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct - Rules Table /PREC5-R3: Concert and entertainment events (including associated buildings and structures)	Peter Holley	234.4	Amend	When hosting Mission Concerts in the past there has sometimes been a need for sound checks to continue until 9.00pm, due to performers getting to the venue late. Extra hours would be useful to get the show ready.	Seeks to Amend PREC5-R3(5) to allow for sound check to continue to no later than 9.00pm on the evening before a concert day.	Open Submission
PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct /PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct - Rules Table /PREC5-R3: Concert and entertainment events (including associated buildings and structures)	Peter Holley	234.5	Amend	Sometimes sound checks exceed noise limitations, therefore sound checks within the specified times are exempt from the noise limitations.	Seeks to Amend PREC5-R3(6) so that concert and entertainment activities in compliance with the condition are exempt from noise limits in the noise chapter.  Details are stated in the full submission.	Open Submission
PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct	Peter Holley	235.6	Amend	<p>Make changes to the Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct Chapter to implement the Artisan Village component of the Mission Masterplan. The area of land affected by the Artisan Village is approximately 2.65ha and will provide for both residential and commercial purposes. The indicative yield is 22 residential units and 3,500m<sup>2</sup> of artisan commercial building floor area. Each change requested to this chapter is individually itemised in submission points 235.26 to 235.42 Refer to full submission for further detail. Full details as to the reasons for requesting these changes are outlined in the s.32 report, however a summary of these are outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed changes progress the best value of land-use mix and presents an opportunity to provide for residential development at a greater density than enabled by the underlying Rural Lifestyle Zone;</li> <li>- The land has limited productive value;</li> <li>- The land is generally higher in elevation and is therefore less susceptible to natural hazards than much of urban Napier;</li> <li>- The land is located immediately opposite existing residential land and the currently developing Mission Residential Precinct behind it;</li> </ul> <p>the proposal is generally consistent with relevant PDP policy direction (particularly DEV3);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Technical supporting information demonstrates feasibility;</li> <li>- Four reasonably practicable options have been considered, and it has been found that the proposed approach is the most effective and efficient;</li> <li>- There are a number of environmental, economic, social and cultural benefits, as well as costs (as detailed in the s.32 report).</li> </ul>	Amend PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct with the additions and deletions set out in the attached document. Submission points 235.26 to 235.42 individually outlines the requested amendments.	Open Submission

# PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct /Introduction /The Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct includes the existing hub of the Mission Estate in the Grande Maison building and other buildings and facilities, including the concert venue. It also includes the backdrop hills framing the iconic Mission landscape as viewed from Church Road	Peter Holley	235.26	Amend	Amend PREC5 as a consequential amendment. The reasons given for this requested change are summarised in submission point 235.2.	Amend PREC5 Introduction as follows:  ....  The Landscape and Visitor Precinct also provides opportunity through the resource consent process, for the development of a boutique hotel (potentially via the redevelopment of the accommodation buildings used by the former seminary), <del>and</del> discretely located and designed individual accommodation buildings separately located within or adjacent to the proposed woodland at the base of the hill. <u>Additional opportunity is provided for an 'artisan village' within the valley to the north of the Grande Maison and behind the production winery as viewed from Church Road, which enables further development of hospitality and artisan commercial and craft activities and associated residential accommodation.</u>	Open Submission
PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct /Objectives /PREC5-O1: Commercial hub	Peter Holley	235.27	Amend	Amend PREC5 as requested to enable the establishment of the Artisan Village. The area of this village is approximately 2.65ha and will accommodate both residential and commercial activities and has an indicative yield of 22 residential units and 3500m2 of artisan commercial building floor area.  Full details as to the reasons for requesting these changes are outlined in the s.32 report, however a summary of these are outlined below:  - The proposed changes progress the best value of land-use mix and presents an opportunity to provide for residential development at a greater density than enabled by the underlying Rural Lifestyle Zone; - The land has limited productive value; - The land is generally higher in elevation and is therefore less susceptible to natural hazards than much of urban Napier; - The land is located immediately opposite existing residential land and the currently developing Mission Residential Precinct behind it; - The proposal is generally consistent with relevant PDP policy direction (particularly DEV3); - Technical supporting information demonstrates feasibility; - Four reasonably practicable options have been considered, and it has been found that the proposed approach is the most effective and efficient; - There are a number of environmental, economic, social and cultural benefits, as well as costs (as detailed in the s.32 report).	Amend PREC5-O1 as follows:  The Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct contains a Mission Estate commercial hub of the cellar door, restaurant, conference and wedding venue, concert venue, <del>and</del> tourist accommodation <u>and an artisan village</u> ; that is bustling with visitors enjoying the ambiance of its offerings and the walking and cycle trails that link to <del>it</del> <u>and between these activities.</u>	Open Submission

# PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct /Policies /PREC5-P1: Hospitality and entertainment.  Relates to DEV3-O1	Peter Holley	235.28	Amend	<p>Amend PREC5 as requested to enable the establishment of the Artisan Village. The area of this village is approximately 2.65ha and will accommodate both residential and commercial activities and has an indicative yield of 22 residential units and 3500m2 of artisan commercial building floor area.</p> <p>Full details as to the reasons for requesting these changes are outlined in the s.32 report, however a summary of these are outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed changes progress the best value of land-use mix and presents an opportunity to provide for residential development at a greater density than enabled by the underlying Rural Lifestyle Zone;</li> <li>- The land has limited productive value;</li> <li>- The land is generally higher in elevation and is therefore less susceptible to natural hazards than much of urban Napier;</li> <li>- The land is located immediately opposite existing residential land and the currently developing Mission Residential Precinct behind it;</li> <li>- The proposal is generally consistent with relevant PDP policy direction (particularly DEV3);</li> <li>- Technical supporting information demonstrates feasibility;</li> <li>- Four reasonably practicable options have been considered, and it has been found that the proposed approach is the most effective and efficient;</li> <li>- There are a number of environmental, economic, social and cultural benefits, as well as costs (as detailed in the s.32 report)</li> </ul>	<p>Amend PREC5-P1 as follows:</p> <p>Enable the continued use and development of the cellar door, restaurant, wedding venue, conference and meeting facility, former seminary buildings and the concert venue.</p> <p>Relates to DEV3-O1, <u>DEV3-O2</u>, and <u>PRC5-O1</u></p>	Open Submission
PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct /Policies /PREC5-P2: Visitor accommodation.  Relates to DEV3-O1	Peter Holley	235.29	Amend	<p>Amend PREC5 as requested to enable the establishment of the Artisan Village. The area of this village is approximately 2.65ha and will accommodate both residential and commercial activities and has an indicative yield of 22 residential units and 3500m2 of artisan commercial building floor area.</p> <p>Full details as to the reasons for requesting these changes are outlined in the s.32 report, however a summary of these are outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* The proposed changes progress the best value of land-use mix and presents an opportunity to provide for residential development at a greater density than enabled by the underlying Rural Lifestyle Zone;</li> <li>* The land has limited productive value;</li> <li>The land is generally higher in elevation and is therefore less susceptible to natural hazards than much of urban Napier;</li> <li>* The land is located immediately opposite existing residential land and the currently developing Mission Residential Precinct behind it;</li> <li>* The proposal is generally consistent with relevant PDP policy direction (particularly DEV3);</li> <li>* Technical supporting information demonstrates feasibility;</li> <li>* Four reasonably practicable options have been considered, and it has been found that the proposed approach is the most effective and efficient;</li> <li>* There are a number of environmental, economic, social and cultural benefits, as well as costs (as detailed in the s.32 report).</li> </ul>	<p>Amend PREC5-P2 as follows:</p> <p>Enable opportunities for the development of additional tourist accommodation in appropriate locations. Relates to DEV3-<del>O1</del><u>O2</u>, and <u>PRC5-O1</u></p>	Open Submission

# PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct /Policies /PREC5-P3: Landscape and connectivity. Relates to DEV3-O1	Peter Holley	235.30	Amend	<p>Amend PREC5 as requested to enable the establishment of the Artisan Village. The area of this village is approximately 2.65ha and will accommodate both residential and commercial activities and has an indicative yield of 22 residential units and 3500m2 of artisan commercial building floor area.</p> <p>Full details as to the reasons for requesting these changes are outlined in the s.32 report, however a summary of these are outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed changes progress the best value of land-use mix and presents an opportunity to provide for residential development at a greater density than enabled by the underlying Rural Lifestyle Zone;</li> <li>- The land has limited productive value;</li> </ul> <p>The land is generally higher in elevation and is therefore less susceptible to natural hazards than much of urban Napier;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The land is located immediately opposite existing residential land and the currently developing Mission Residential Precinct behind it;</li> <li>- The proposal is generally consistent with relevant PDP policy direction (particularly DEV3);</li> <li>- Technical supporting information demonstrates feasibility;</li> <li>- Four reasonably practicable options have been considered, and it has been found that the proposed approach is the most effective and efficient;</li> <li>- There are a number of environmental, economic, social and cultural benefits, as well as costs (as detailed in the s.32 report).</li> </ul>	<p>Amend PREC5-P3 as follows:</p> <p>Provide for the woodland planting of the background hills (eastern hill face), the development of a lookout reserve on top of these hills, and the development of walking and cycling tracks through the woodland and across the hill providing connections to the wider Napier City walking and cycling network.</p> <p><u>Relates to DEV3-O1, and DEV3-O3</u></p>	Open Submission
PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct /Policies /General	Peter Holley	235.31	Amend	<p>Amend PREC5 as requested to enable the establishment of the Artisan Village. The area of this village is approximately 2.65ha and will accommodate both residential and commercial activities and has an indicative yield of 22 residential units and 3500m2 of artisan commercial building floor area.</p> <p>Full details as to the reasons for requesting these changes are outlined in the s.32 report, however a summary of these are outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed changes progress the best value of land-use mix and presents an opportunity to provide for residential development at a greater density than enabled by the underlying Rural Lifestyle Zone;</li> <li>- The land has limited productive value;</li> </ul> <p>The land is generally higher in elevation and is therefore less susceptible to natural hazards than much of urban Napier;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The land is located immediately opposite existing residential land and the currently developing Mission Residential Precinct behind it;</li> <li>- The proposal is generally consistent with relevant PDP policy direction (particularly DEV3);</li> <li>- Technical supporting information demonstrates feasibility;</li> <li>- Four reasonably practicable options have been considered, and it has been found that the proposed approach is the most effective and efficient;</li> <li>- There are a number of environmental, economic, social and cultural benefits, as well as costs (as detailed in the s.32 report).</li> </ul>	<p>Add a new policy to PREC5 as follows:</p> <p><u>PREC5-P4: Tourism, artisan commercial and residential</u>  <u>Enable the development of an artisan village in accordance with the concept plan, in a manner that enables opportunity for the development of tourism, craft and hospitality activities and residential accommodation, in a manner that maintains the special character of the area.</u></p> <p><u>Relates to DEV3-O1, DEV3-O2, DEV3-O4 and PRC5-O1</u></p>	Open Submission

# PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct /PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct - Rules Table /PREC5-R5: Art cabins, where located within area identified on structure plan.	Peter Holley	235.32	Amend	<p>Amend PREC5 as requested to enable the establishment of the Artisan Village. The area of this village is approximately 2.65ha and will accommodate both residential and commercial activities and has an indicative yield of 22 residential units and 3500m2 of artisan commercial building floor area.</p> <p>Full details as to the reasons for requesting these changes are outlined in the s.32 report, however a summary of these are outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed changes progress the best value of land-use mix and presents an opportunity to provide for residential development at a greater density than enabled by the underlying Rural Lifestyle Zone;</li> <li>- The land has limited productive value;</li> <li>- The land is generally higher in elevation and is therefore less susceptible to natural hazards than much of urban Napier;</li> <li>- The land is located immediately opposite existing residential land and the currently developing Mission Residential Precinct behind it;</li> <li>- The proposal is generally consistent with relevant PDP policy direction (particularly DEV3);</li> <li>- Technical supporting information demonstrates feasibility;</li> <li>- Four reasonably practicable options have been considered, and it has been found that the proposed approach is the most effective and efficient;</li> <li>- There are a number of environmental, economic, social and cultural benefits, as well as costs (as detailed in the s.32 report).</li> </ul>	<p>Amend PREC5-R5 as follows:</p> <p>....</p> <p><del>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>5. Character of the Mission Development Area</del></li> <li><del>6. Landscape character</del></li> <li><del>7. Public health and safety</del></li> <li><del>8. Amenity values</del></li> <li><del>9. Safe and efficient operation of the integrated transportation network</del></li> <li><del>10. Reverse sensitivity</del></li> <li><del>11. The matters set out under DEV3-AC1 and PREC12-AC2.</del></li> </ul> <p><del>Notification: Non-notified</del></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></p> <p>....</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>11. The matters set out under DEV3-AC1 and PREC5-AC3</u></li> </ul>	Open Submission
PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct /PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct - Rules Table /General	Peter Holley	235.33	Amend	<p>Add a new rule. Full details as to the reasons for requesting these changes are outlined in the s.32 report, however a summary of these are outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed changes progress the best value of land-use mix and presents an opportunity to provide for residential development at a greater density than enabled by the underlying Rural Lifestyle Zone;</li> <li>- The land has limited productive value;</li> <li>- The land is generally higher in elevation and is therefore less susceptible to natural hazards than much of urban Napier;</li> <li>- The land is located immediately opposite existing residential land and the currently developing Mission Residential Precinct behind it;</li> <li>- The proposal is generally consistent with relevant PDP policy direction (particularly DEV3);</li> <li>- Technical supporting information demonstrates feasibility;</li> <li>- Four reasonably practicable options have been considered, and it has been found that the proposed approach is the most effective and efficient;</li> <li>- There are a number of environmental, economic, social and cultural benefits, as well as costs (as detailed in the s.32 report).</li> </ul>	<p>Add a new rule as follows:</p> <p><u>PREC5-R7 Commercial and craft activities within the artisan village area</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status: Restricted discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Where the following activity conditions are met:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>1. Commercial and craft buildings and activities are located within the 'Artisan Village Commercial Development Node' identified on the Structure Plan at Appendices APP7(g) – (i).</u></li> <li><u>2. The maximum building gross floor area of commercial and craft buildings within the Artisan Commercial Building Area shall be 3,500m2.</u></li> <li><u>3. Associated vehicular access and stormwater swales shall be provided in accordance with the Artisan Village Structure Plan at Appendices APP7(g) and APP7(h).</u></li> </ul> <p><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>1. Character of the Mission Development Area</u></li> <li><u>2. Landscape character</u></li> <li><u>3. Public health and safety</u></li> <li><u>4. Amenity values</u></li> <li><u>5. Safe and efficient operation of the integrated transportation network</u></li> <li><u>6. Utility service provision</u></li> <li><u>7. Reverse sensitivity</u></li> <li><u>8. The matters set out under DEV3-AC1, PREC5-AC2 and PREC5-</u></li> </ul>	Open Submission

# PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct /PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct - Rules Table /General	Peter Holley	235.34	Amend	<p>Add a new rule to PREC5. Full details as to the reasons for requesting these changes are outlined in the s.32 report, however a summary of these are outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed changes progress the best value of land-use mix and presents an opportunity to provide for residential development at a greater density than enabled by the underlying Rural Lifestyle Zone;</li> <li>- The land has limited productive value;</li> </ul> <p>The land is generally higher in elevation and is therefore less susceptible to natural hazards than much of urban Napier;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The land is located immediately opposite existing residential land and the currently developing Mission Residential Precinct behind it;</li> <li>- The proposal is generally consistent with relevant PDP policy direction (particularly DEV3);</li> <li>- Technical supporting information demonstrates feasibility;</li> <li>- Four reasonably practicable options have been considered, and it has been found that the proposed approach is the most effective and efficient;</li> <li>- There are a number of environmental, economic, social and cultural benefits, as well as costs (as detailed in the s.32 report).</li> </ul>	<p>Add a new rule as follows:</p> <p><u>PREC5-R8 Residential activities within the artisan village area</u>  <u>Activity Status: Restricted discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Where the following activity conditions are met:1. Residential Units are located within the 'Artisan Village Residential Development Node' identified on the Structure Plan at Appendices APP7(g) – (i).</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:1. Character of the Mission Development Area</u>  <u>2. Landscape character</u>  <u>3. Public health and safety</u>  <u>4. Amenity values</u>  <u>5. Safe and efficient operation of the integrated transportation network</u>  <u>6. Utility service provision</u>  <u>7. Reverse sensitivity</u>  <u>8. The matters set out under DEV3-AC1 and PREC5- AC5.</u></p> <p><u>Notification status: Any application under this rule is precluded from being notified on a public or limited basis.</u>  <u>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met:</u>  <u>Non complying</u></p>	Open Submission
PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct /PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct - Rules Table /General	Peter Holley	235.35	Amend	<p>Add a new rule to PREC5. Full details as to the reasons for requesting these changes are outlined in the s.32 report, however a summary of these are outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed changes progress the best value of land-use mix and presents an opportunity to provide for residential development at a greater density than enabled by the underlying Rural Lifestyle Zone;</li> <li>- The land has limited productive value;</li> <li>- The land is generally higher in elevation and is therefore less susceptible to natural hazards than much of urban Napier;</li> <li>- The land is located immediately opposite existing residential land and the currently developing Mission Residential Precinct behind it;</li> <li>- The proposal is generally consistent with relevant PDP policy direction (particularly DEV3);</li> <li>- Technical supporting information demonstrates feasibility;</li> <li>- Four reasonably practicable options have been considered, and it has been found that the proposed approach is the most effective and efficient;</li> <li>- There are a number of environmental, economic, social and cultural benefits, as well as costs (as detailed in the s.32 report).</li> </ul>	<p>Add a new rule as follows:</p> <p><u>PREC5-R9 Subdivision within the Artisan Village Area</u>  <u>Activity Status: Restricted discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Where the following activity conditions are met:</u>  <u>1. The subdivision is applied for concurrently with, or following approval of, land use resource consent for buildings under rules PREC5-R7 (Commercial and craft activities) and / or PREC5-R8 (Residential activities).</u>  <u>2. Allotments must be designed to include buildings (proposed or established under rules PREC5-R7 or PREC5-R8) that with appropriate easements are capable of being used as independent commercial or residential units. This condition does not apply to the balance allotment or access or reserve allotments.</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u>  <u>1. The matters of discretion for subdivision in the Subdivision chapter apply.</u>  <u>2. The matters set out under DEV3-AC1 and PREC5- AC6.</u></p> <p><u>Notification status: Any application under this rule is precluded from being notified on a public or limited basis.</u>  <u>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met:</u>  <u>Non complying</u></p>	Open Submission



# PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct /PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct - Rules Table /PREC5-R7: Commercial activities not otherwise provided for in the Mission Landscape and Visitor PrecinctActivity Status: Discretionary	Peter Holley	235.36	Amend	<p>Amend PREC5-R7 as a consequential amendment. Full details as to the reasons for requesting these changes are outlined in the s.32 report, however a summary of these are outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed changes progress the best value of land-use mix and presents an opportunity to provide for residential development at a greater density than enabled by the underlying Rural Lifestyle Zone;</li> <li>- The land has limited productive value;</li> <li>- The land is generally higher in elevation and is therefore less susceptible to natural hazards than much of urban Napier;</li> <li>- The land is located immediately opposite existing residential land and the currently developing Mission Residential Precinct behind it;</li> <li>- The proposal is generally consistent with relevant PDP policy direction (particularly DEV3);</li> <li>- Technical supporting information demonstrates feasibility;</li> <li>- Four reasonably practicable options have been considered, and it has been found that the proposed approach is the most effective and efficient;</li> <li>- There are a number of environmental, economic, social and cultural benefits, as well as costs (as detailed in the s.32 report).</li> </ul>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p><del>PREC5-R7-R10</del> Commercial activities not otherwise provided for in the Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct</p>	Open Submission
PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct /PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct - Rules Table /PREC5-R8: Activities not otherwise provided for in the Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct.	Peter Holley	235.37	Amend	<p>Amend PREC-R8 as a consequential amendment. Full details as to the reasons for requesting these changes are outlined in the s.32 report, however a summary of these are outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed changes progress the best value of land-use mix and presents an opportunity to provide for residential development at a greater density than enabled by the underlying Rural Lifestyle Zone;</li> <li>- The land has limited productive value;</li> <li>- The land is generally higher in elevation and is therefore less susceptible to natural hazards than much of urban Napier;</li> <li>- The land is located immediately opposite existing residential land and the currently developing Mission Residential Precinct behind it;</li> <li>- The proposal is generally consistent with relevant PDP policy direction (particularly DEV3);</li> <li>- Technical supporting information demonstrates feasibility;</li> <li>- Four reasonably practicable options have been considered, and it has been found that the proposed approach is the most effective and efficient;</li> <li>- There are a number of environmental, economic, social and cultural benefits, as well as costs (as detailed in the s.32 report).</li> </ul>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p><del>PREC5-R8 R11</del> Activities not otherwise provided for in the Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct</p>	Open Submission
PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct /PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct - Standards Table /PREC5-S1: Density.	Peter Holley	235.38	Amend	<p>Amend PREC5-S1. Full details as to the reasons for requesting these changes are outlined in the s.32 report, however a summary of these are outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed changes progress the best value of land-use mix and presents an opportunity to provide for residential development at a greater density than enabled by the underlying Rural Lifestyle Zone;</li> <li>- The land has limited productive value;</li> <li>- The land is generally higher in elevation and is therefore less susceptible to natural hazards than much of urban Napier;</li> <li>- The land is located immediately opposite existing residential land and the currently developing Mission Residential Precinct behind it;</li> <li>- The proposal is generally consistent with relevant PDP policy direction (particularly DEV3);</li> <li>- Technical supporting information demonstrates feasibility;</li> <li>- Four reasonably practicable options have been considered, and it has been found that the proposed approach is the most effective and efficient;</li> <li>- There are a number of environmental, economic, social and cultural benefits, as well as costs (as detailed in the s.32 report).</li> </ul>	<p>Amend PREC5-S1 as follows:</p> <p><u>1. Excepting residential units within the Artisan Village Concept Plan area,</u> the maximum density must not exceed one residential unit per site, or one residential unit per precinct where a single site covers more than one precinct (that is, a single site could have more than one residential unit provided each residential unit on the site was in a different precinct).</p> <p><u>1.2. A maximum of 22 residential units may be established within the Artisan Village Residential Development Node.</u></p>	Open Submission

# PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct /PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct - Standards Table /General	Peter Holley	235.39	Amend	<p>Add a new standard. Full details as to the reasons for requesting these changes are outlined in the s.32 report, however a summary of these are outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed changes progress the best value of land-use mix and presents an opportunity to provide for residential development at a greater density than enabled by the underlying Rural Lifestyle Zone;</li> <li>- The land has limited productive value;</li> <li>- The land is generally higher in elevation and is therefore less susceptible to natural hazards than much of urban Napier;</li> <li>- The land is located immediately opposite existing residential land and the currently developing Mission Residential Precinct behind it;</li> <li>- The proposal is generally consistent with relevant PDP policy direction (particularly DEV3);</li> <li>- Technical supporting information demonstrates feasibility;</li> <li>- Four reasonably practicable options have been considered, and it has been found that the proposed approach is the most effective and efficient;</li> <li>- There are a number of environmental, economic, social and cultural benefits, as well as costs (as detailed in the s.32 report).</li> </ul>	<p>Add a new standard as follows:</p> <p><u>PREC5-S4 Other yards</u>  <u>Purpose: to maintain the character of the Mission Landscape and Visitor precinct and enable the establishment of the Artisan Village concept</u>  <u>1. There shall be no side or rear yard requirement for buildings provided for by rules PREC5-R7 and PREC5-R8, to enable terraced building typologies within the Artisan Village Residential and Commercial Development Nodes.</u>  <u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u>  <u>NA</u></p>	Open Submission
PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct /PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct - Standards Table /PREC5-S4: Trees.	Peter Holley	235.40		Amend PREC5-S4 as a consequential amendment (refer to full submission for more detail). Refer to submission point 235.2 for a summary of the reasons for requesting the change.	Amend as follows: PREC5-S4 <u>5</u> Trees	Open Submission
PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct /Assessment criteria /PREC5-AC3: Art cabins.	Peter Holley	235.41	Amend	Amend PREC5-AC3 to make correct an error in numbering.	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>....</p> <p>b....</p> <p>iv. Uncluttered by cars and parking – access to be by foot or special golf-cart type vehicle to achieve the feel of the cabin immersed within the landscape.</p>	Open Submission
PREC5 - Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct /Assessment criteria /General	Peter Holley	235.42	Amend	Add new assessment criteria. (refer to full submission for more detail): Refer to submission point 235.2 for a summary of the reasons for requesting the change.	<p><u>Add new assessment criteria as follows:PREC5-AC4 – Commercial and Craft Activities within Artisan Village</u>  <u>The assessment criteria of the Mission Development Area, the Rural Lifestyle Zone and the Subdivision chapter apply in addition to the below:</u>  <u>a. Whether a proposal for commercial or craft activities is located within the area depicted in Appendices APP7(g) – (j) as within the Artisan Village ‘Commercial Development Node’.</u>  <u>b. Whether the building design and site layout achieves the following characteristics:</u>  <u>i. Strong sense of place in keeping with the character of the Mission Development Area.</u>  <u>ii. Provides a visitor experience, with architecture and landscaping designed to celebrate the setting and walkways to link the buildings with the Grande Maison, the Mission Residential Precinct, and Church Road.</u>  <u>iii. Implements the stormwater swale design shown in Appendix APP7(h) and otherwise mitigates any potential adverse effects of stormwater quality and quantity on the Taipo Stream.</u>  <u>iv. Provides a suitable building setback from the toe of the hills, or other mitigation, to ensure any potential adverse effects from slope instability can be appropriately avoided or mitigated.</u>  <u>c. Whether commercial and craft activities are in keeping with one or more of the following themes:</u>  <u>i. Relationship to Mission Estate and / or the Hawke’s Bay wine and food industry.</u>  <u>ii. Production of artisan or craft products and the retail of those</u></p>	Open Submission

# PREC6 - Mission Productive Rural Precinct

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PREC6 - Mission Productive Rural Precinct /Rules	Angela McFlynn	189.55	Amend	Considers that it is assumed that the intention for the Mission Productive Rural Precinct Rules are for them to apply in addition to the Rules for the Rural Production Zone (RPROZ), as this PREC6 - Mission Productive Rural Precinct Section clearly states that each of the objectives, policies and standards of the RPROZ apply in addition to the provisions that are specific to the Precinct. For the avoidance of doubt, it should also be clearly stated that the Rules of the RPROZ also apply if this is the case.	Amend the PREC6 - Mission Productive Rural Precinct Section by including a statement confirming whether or not the Rules of the Rural Production Zone (RPROZ) are intended to apply in this Precinct.	<a href="#">Open Submission</a>
PREC6 - Mission Productive Rural Precinct /Rules /PREC6-R1: Rural processing activities.	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.10	Amend	The permitted activity rule as currently drafted doesn't have any restriction on the scale of rural processing activities, or whether it needs to support activities on the land. It therefore does not give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. Rural processing activities may be appropriate as enabled through Clauses 3.9(2) and 3.9(3) however an assessment would be required.	Change activity status for PREC6-R1 from Permitted to Restricted Discretionary Activity (non-notified).	<a href="#">Open Submission</a>

# PREC7 - Mission Rural Residential Precinct

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PREC7 - Mission Rural Residential Precinct /PREC7 - Mission Rural Residential Precinct - Standards Table /PREC7-S1: Density.	Cameron Drury	128.22	Oppose	The area presents opportunity for greater development.	Amend in line with the relief sought for SUB-S3 above (previous submission point 128.21).	Open Submission
PREC7 - Mission Rural Residential Precinct /Assessment criteria /PREC7-AC2: All standard infringements (PREC7-S1 - PREC7-S2)	Cameron Drury	128.40	Oppose	Oppose PREC7-AC2(d) - The GRZ-AC1 assessment criteria applies to the General Residential Zone and is likely to be inappropriate for a Rural Residential Zone.	Delete (d).	Open Submission
PREC7 - Mission Rural Residential Precinct /PREC7 - Mission Rural Residential Precinct - Rules Table	Angela McFlynn	189.56	Amend	Considers that it is assumed that the Rules for the Mission Rural Residential Precinct (PREC7) are to apply in addition to the Rules for the Rural Lifestyle Zone (RLZ), as this Section clearly states that each of the objectives, policies and standards of the RLZ apply in addition to the provisions that are specific to the Precinct. For the avoidance of doubt it should also be clearly stated that the rules of the RLZ also apply if this is indeed the case.	Amend PREC 7 - Mission Rural Residential Precinct - Rules Table so that it includes a statement confirming whether or not the Rules of the Rural Lifestyle Zone (RLZ) are intended to apply in this Precinct.	Open Submission
PREC7 - Mission Rural Residential Precinct	Peter Holley	235.7	Amend	Seeks consequential amendments to the Mission Rural Residential Precinct as a result of changing the zoning of the south eastern component of that precinct to General Residential and to the new Mission Church Road Residential Precinct. The changes sought can be found in submission points 235.43 to 235.48.	The changes sought can be found in submission points 235.43 to 235.48.	Open Submission
PREC7 - Mission Rural Residential Precinct /Policies /PREC7-P2: Existing buildings.  Relates to DEV3-O1	Peter Holley	235.43	Oppose	Delete PREC14-P2 as a consequential amendment as a result of changing the zoning of the south eastern component of that precinct to General Residential and to the new Mission Church Road Residential Precinct. Refer to submission point 235.2 for a summary of the reasons for requesting the change.	Delete PREC14-P2.	Open Submission
PREC7 - Mission Rural Residential Precinct /PREC7 - Mission Rural Residential Precinct - Rules Table /PREC7-R2: Use of the Maryknoll buildings as identified on the Structure Plan for visitor accommodation or education activities.	Peter Holley	235.44	Oppose	Delete PREC14-R2 as a consequential amendment as a result of changing the zoning of the south eastern component of that precinct to General Residential and to the new Mission Church Road Residential Precinct. Refer to submission point 235.2 for a summary of the reasons for requesting the change.	Delete PREC14-R2	Open Submission
PREC7 - Mission Rural Residential Precinct /PREC7 - Mission Rural Residential Precinct - Rules Table /PREC7-R3: Commercial activities utilising buildings existing on 1 January 2017.	Peter Holley	235.45	Oppose	Delete PREC14-R3 as a consequential amendment as a result of changing the zoning of the south eastern component of that precinct to General Residential and to the new Mission Church Road Residential Precinct. Refer to submission point 235.2 for a summary of the reasons for requesting the change.	Delete PREC14-R3	Open Submission
PREC7 - Mission Rural Residential Precinct /PREC7 - Mission Rural Residential Precinct - Rules Table /PREC7-R4: Activities not otherwise provided for.	Peter Holley	235.46	Amend	Amend PREC7-R4 as a consequential amendment as a result of changing the zoning of the south eastern component of that precinct to General Residential and to the new Mission Church Road Residential Precinct. Refer to submission point 235.2 for a summary of the reasons for requesting the change.	Amend PREC7-R4 as follows:  PREC7- <del>R4</del> R2 Activities not otherwise provided for  Activity Status: non-complying  Where the following activity conditions are met: 1. The activity is not provided for under Rules PREC7-R1 - <del>PREC14-R4</del> or the Rural Residential Zone activity table	Open Submission

# PREC7 - Mission Rural Residential Precinct

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PREC7 - Mission Rural Residential Precinct /PREC7 - Mission Rural Residential Precinct - Rules Table /PREC7-R4: Activities not otherwise provided for.	Peter Holley	235.47	Amend	Amend PREC7-R5 as a consequential amendment as a result of changing the zoning of the south eastern component of that precinct to General Residential and to the new Mission Church Road Residential Precinct. Refer to submission point 235.2 for a summary of the reasons for requesting the change.	<p>Amend PREC7-R5 as follows:</p> <p><del>PREC7-R5 R3</del> Subdivision</p> <p><del>PREC7-R5AR3A</del> Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>1. The relevant activity conditions in the chapter SUB Subdivision are complied with.</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <p>2. The matters of discretion for the relevant subdivision activity in the Subdivision chapter apply.</p> <p>3. The matters set out under DEV3-AC1 and PREC7-AC1</p> <p><del>PREC7-R5BR3B</del></p> <p>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: Discretionary.</p>	Open Submission
PREC7 - Mission Rural Residential Precinct /Assessment criteria /PREC7-AC1: All subdivision and development.	Peter Holley	235.48	Amend	Amend PREC7-AC1 as a consequential amendment as a result of changing the zoning of the south eastern component of that precinct to General Residential and to the new Mission Church Road Residential Precinct. Refer to submission point 235.2 for a summary of the reasons for requesting the change.	<p>Amend PREC7-AC1 as follows:</p> <p>a. ....</p> <p>ii. provide.....to be administered by <del>Marist Holdings (Greenmeadows) Ltd</del>the subdivider or successor</p> <p>b. ....</p> <p>v. Consideration of rural heritage values (<del>i.e. the traditional farming buildings and yards on the Church Road frontage</del>)</p> <p>c. ...</p> <p>i. Composition of the panel (it is envisaged the panel will include a representative of <del>the subdivider Marist Holdings Ltd</del> (or successor), one or two design professionals covering architecture, urban design and landscape...</p>	Open Submission

# NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /NCZ-Neighbourhood Centre Zone - Standards Table /NCZ-S9: Fences and walls	Susan Dallas	25.26	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /NCZ-Neighbourhood Centre Zone - Standards Table /NCZ-S9: Fences and walls	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.24	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /General	Stephen Robinson	40.1	Support	Supports 53 Latham Street being a NCZ (Neighbourhood Centre Zone). Considers that Neighbourhood Centres serve passers-by as well as their immediate residential neighbourhood through development type and tenures.	Retain 53 Latham Street being a NCZ as notified.	Open Submission
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /	Lynda Otter	44.1	Oppose	Considers the NCZ - Commercial Zones focus should be on providing a level of activity that is appropriate to a particular Neighbourhood Centre Zone or Commercial Zone given that centres and commercial areas have a different mixture of street typologies (e.g. parking infrastructure, passive recreation and amenity). There is no justification for Commercially Zoning (NCZ, LCZ, LFRZ, MUZ, TCZ, CCZ) for new or extended businesses where essential services are already provided as this will not result in a well-functioning urban environment.	Seeks deletion of Part 3 - Area-Specific Matters - Commercial Zone from Pak N Save opposite Leicester and Coventry Avenues, Tamatea, Napier 4112.  Also seeks Commercial Zones (e.g. NCZ, LCZ, LFRZ, MUZ, TCZ, CCZ) deletion from PDP Maps where essential commercial services are already provided.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone - Rules Table /NCZ-R5: Residential activities	Andrea Millar	105.14	Support	Supports the permitted activity rules applying to “residential units” and “residential activity” in the zone as appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided by Ara Poutama.	Retain permitted activity rule NCZ-R5 applying to “residential activities” in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Open Submission
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /Introduction	Sera Chambers	150.146	Amend	Amend to continue to allow the people of Napier the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	seeks to amend so that existing adjoining property/landowners have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Open Submission
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /Policies	Sera Chambers	150.147	Amend	Amend to continue to allow the people of Napier the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	seeks to amend so that existing adjoining property/landowners have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Open Submission
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /Policies	Sera Chambers	150.148	Amend	Amend to continue to allow the people of Napier the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	seeks to amend so that existing adjoining property/landowners have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Open Submission
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone - Rules Table	Sera Chambers	150.149	Amend	Amend to continue to allow the people of Napier the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	seeks to amend so that existing adjoining property/landowners have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Open Submission
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone - Rules Table	Sera Chambers	150.150	Amend	Amend to continue to allow the people of Napier the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	seeks to amend so that existing adjoining property/landowners have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Open Submission
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone - Rules Table /NCZ-R4A	Sera Chambers	150.151	Amend	Amend to continue to allow the people of Napier the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	seeks to amend so that existing adjoining property/landowners have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Open Submission
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone - Rules Table /NCZ-R7A	Sera Chambers	150.152	Amend	Amend to continue to allow the people of Napier the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	seeks to amend so that existing adjoining property/landowners have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Open Submission
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone - Rules Table	Sera Chambers	150.153	Amend	Amend to continue to allow the people of Napier the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	seeks to amend so that existing adjoining property/landowners have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Open Submission
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone - Rules Table	Sera Chambers	150.154	Amend	Amend to continue to allow the people of Napier the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	seeks to amend so that existing adjoining property/landowners have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Open Submission



# NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /Assessment criteria	Sera Chambers	150.170	Amend	Amend to continue to allow the people of Napier the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	seeks to amend so that existing adjoining property/landowners have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Open Submission
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone - Rules Table /	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.62	Amend	Rules are not listed in order of activity status.	Amend rule ordering and numbering to list permitted activities first, followed by controlled, restricted discretionary, discretionary, non-complying.	Open Submission
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone - Rules Table /NCZ-R7: Car parking areas	Holly Jenkins	214.2	Amend	Support standards to manage the attractiveness and interface of at grade car parking areas in commercial zones. Considers the standards fail to recognise practicalities of supermarkets and other commercial activities and that standards require a large portion of a site to be occupied for this purpose. Considers an either/or approach appropriate to achieve landscaping outcomes	Seek that the landscaping requirement of NCZ-R7; LCZ-R10; LFRZ-R3; TCZ-R7; CCZ-R6 be an either/or:  Where the car parking area is at-grade: a. a 2 m wide landscaping strip comprised of indigenous plants is provided along the full frontage of the road (except for the vehicle crossing), <del>and</del> or b. one indigenous specimen tree is provided for every ten car parks.	Open Submission
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone - Standards Table /NCZ-S5: Frontages	Holly Jenkins	214.7	Amend	Considers the need for supermarkets and other commercial activities to locate back from the street for part of a site's frontage to enable vehicle access, manoeuvring and car parking in front of the store. Considers it impractical to be completely built to the street and taking pedestrian access directly from the street and for a large portion of the building to be glazed due to heat transfer over fresh produce	Amend the standard to provide an alternative landscaping requirement along an Activated Street where it is not possible for a building to adjoin the entire length of the frontage, or provide direct pedestrian access. Amend the standard to recognise the functional and operational requirements of a supermarkets which cannot support large areas of glazing.	Open Submission
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone - Rules Table /	Sean Thompson	225.8	Amend	Considers that it is not self-evident from the analysis and rationale in the proposed plan, including in terms of s 32 RMA, why relocated buildings should be classified as non-complying in the NCZ, LCZ, LFRZ, LIZ and GIZ. It is accepted that relocated buildings should be discretionary in the Natural Open Space Zone, and there may be urban design and other considerations applicable to the Town Centre Zone and City Centre Zone which warrant different treatment.  Since a 2004 Central Otago Environment Court decision most local authorities in New Zealand have either adopted permitted activity classification for relocated buildings (with no standards) or provided for permitted activity status with prescribed performance standards.	Seeks to amend the NCZ Rules as follows: a. Provide for relocated buildings as a permitted activity in all relevant zones (including NCZ), excepting where a specified heritage or conservation or urban design consideration applies; b. For the relocated building rules in all zones, the removal of the requirement to deposit a monitoring fee at the same time as submitting the relocated building report; c. Amending the performance standards in relation to relocated buildings in accordance with the wording in the attached Schedule 1 (which can be found in the attached submission), to provide for: i. modification of the performance timeframes such that relocation on permanent foundation is required within two months, and twelve months is allowed for the completion of all reinstatement works; ii. provision for a pre-inspection report in the same or similar form as found in Schedule 2 (which can be found in the attached submission).  Consequential or further relief including to the relevant objectives, policies and provisions of the proposed plan in order to give effect to relief sought.  (The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)	Open Submission
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /Objectives /NCZ-O1: Neighbourhood centre function	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.69	Amend	Supports this objective and seeks an amendment to explicitly recognise and provide for educational activities in the NCZ as these activities are necessary to service residential growth.  Educational facilities do not meet the definition of community activities and should therefore be outlined clearly here.	Seeks to make the following amendment:  Neighbourhood centres have small-scale commercial and community activities <u>including educational facilities</u> that service the needs of the immediate residential neighbourhood.	Open Submission
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /Objectives /NCZ-O4: Access and connectivity	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.70	Support	Supports this objective to enable well connected neighbourhoods through the establishment of multi-modal infrastructure.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission



# NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /Policies /NCZ-P1: Neighbourhood centre function	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.71	Amend	Seeks an amendment to explicitly recognise and provide for educational activities in NCZ as these activities are necessary to service residential growth. Amendments requested will align with changes requested to NCZ-O1.	Seeks to amend NCZ-P1 to: Protect the function of the neighbourhood centre as a service centre for the immediate residential catchment including by: a. providing for a range of commercial and community activities <u>and educational facilities</u> ; and b. restricting large format retail and industrial activities.	Open Submission
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /Policies /NCZ-P4: Access and connectivity	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.72	Support	Supports this objective to enable well connected neighbourhoods through the establishment of multi-modal infrastructure. The Ministry supports the uptake of students choosing active modes of travel to schools as has health benefits and reduces traffic congestion on the road network at peak pick up and drop off time.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone - Rules Table /NCZ-R9: Educational activities	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.73	Amend	The Ministry does not support educational facilities as a discretionary activity. Educational facilities should be provided for as a restricted discretionary activity in the neighbourhood centres, as educational facilities are essential pieces of social infrastructure required to support the surrounding residential and commercial activities. Any effects council are concerned about can be well managed through appropriate matters of discretion. The matters of discretion proposed, have been taken from other chapters in the Plan. However, if council does not support these, the Ministry would appreciate the opportunity to work with council to come to an agreement on these matters of discretion.  The Ministry also requests to amend the title to 'educational facilities' to be consistent with the rest of the Plan and use a term that is defined in the definitions chapter.	Seeks to amend the title to read 'educational facilities' rather than education facilities. Seeks to make the following amendment to make educational facilities a restricted discretionary. NCZ-R9: Educational <del>facility activities</del> Activity Status: <u>Restricted</u> Discretionary <u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u> 1. <u>Scale, design, layout, setbacks and screening;</u> 2. <u>Contribution to local community wellbeing;</u> 3. <u>Effects on the streetscape and neighbourhood character;</u>	Open Submission
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone - Rules Table /General	Sam Goddard	238.6	Amend	The zone provides for commercial activities with an area up to 500m <sup>2</sup> as a restricted discretionary activity however it is unclear if this includes retail activities. Commercial activities greater than this are a non-complying activity therefore considers that explicit provision should be made for supermarkets within the zone.	Include specific provision for supermarkets in the Local Centre Zone with the following activity statuses:  • Supermarkets up to 500m <sup>2</sup> - Permitted • Supermarkets greater than 500m <sup>2</sup> up to 2,000m <sup>2</sup> - Restricted Discretionary • Supermarkets greater than 2,000m <sup>2</sup> - Discretionary • Supermarkets greater than 4,000m <sup>2</sup> - Non - complying	Open Submission
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone - Rules Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.65	Amend	Fire and Emergency requires the ability to construct and operate emergency service facilities (i.e., fire stations) in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies. This means new fire stations may be necessary in any zone across the district in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations.  Fire and Emergency notes that the effects of a fire station can be largely anticipated and, in the most part, do not differ to the effects of many activities that may be anticipated through rural and urban environments.  Fire and Emergency requests that emergency service facilities are provided for as permitted activities in the larger, more extensive zones of the district to recognise the critical importance of emergency services to communities. In providing for emergency service facility as a permitted activity would mean that emergency service facilities would be controlled by the subsequent performance standards of each zone (such as height, height in relation to boundary, front yards, building coverage requirements).and the other relevant performance standards in other chapters (i.e., transport) to ensure that any effects are appropriately managed.	Seeks to include new permitted activity as follows: <u>xxx-Rx: Emergency service facilities</u>  <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u>  <u>N/A</u>  <u>Or</u>  <u>To similar effect.</u>  <u>And</u>  <u>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.</u>	Open Submission

# NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /NCZ-Neighbourhood Centre Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.84	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency's main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</p> <p>SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.</p> <p>In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure and that new connections under the water supply</p>	<p>Seeks to include a new performance standard as follows:</p> <p><u>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</u></p> <p>1. <u>All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u></p> <p>2. <u>Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p><u>Matter of discretion:</u></p> <p>1. <u>The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to</p>	Open Submission
NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone /Policies /NCZ-P5: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Alec Duncan	288.131	Support	<p>Fire and Emergency supports this policy to the extent that it seeks to ensure sufficient infrastructure provision and/or mitigation measures to meet demand, including consideration of the effects of climate change.</p>	<p>Retain as notified.</p>	Open Submission

# LCZ - Local Centre Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Standards Table /LCZ-S9: Fences and walls.	Susan Dallas	25.27	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan. (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Standards Table /LCZ-S9: Fences and walls.	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.25	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Rules Table /LCZ-R4: Residential activitiesLCZ-R4A	Andrea Millar	105.15	Support	Supports the permitted activity rules applying to “residential units” and “residential activity” in the zone as appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided by Ara Poutama.	Retain permitted activity rule LCZ-R4 applying to “residential activities” in the Local Centre Zone.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Rules Table /LCZ-R14: Activities not otherwise provided for	Andrea Millar	105.16	Oppose	Opposes the activity rules applying to community corrections activity” as they do not enable community corrections activities, and provides non-complying activity status for these activities in the zone under LCZ-R14. Considers the importance of Community corrections activities and the need to enable non-custodial community corrections sites including within the zone which is easily accessible to offenders, where commercial, community and other similar activities are enabled as of right.	Insert a new permitted activity rule for "community corrections activities" in the Local Centre Zone, as follows: <u>LCZ-RX: Community corrections activities</u> Activity Status: Permitted <u>NA</u>	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /Introduction	Sera Chambers	150.171	Amend	Considers that the introduction should be amended to ensure that existing adjoining property/landowners have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Amend the information to add that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Local Centre Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /Issues	Sera Chambers	150.172	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Local Centre Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /Objectives Relates to LCZ-I3	Sera Chambers	150.173	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Local Centre Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /Policies. Relates to LCZ-O2	Sera Chambers	150.174	Amend	Considers that the policy should be amended to ensure that existing adjoining property/landowners have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Amend the policy to add that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Local Centre Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /Policies . Relates to LCZ-O3	Sera Chambers	150.175	Oppose	Considers that the policy should be amended to ensure that existing adjoining property/landowners have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Amend the policy to add that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Local Centre Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Rules Table	Sera Chambers	150.176	Oppose	Considers that the introduction should be amended to ensure that existing adjoining property/landowners have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Local Centre Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Rules Table /LCZ-R3A	Sera Chambers	150.177	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Local Centre Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Rules Table	Sera Chambers	150.178	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Local Centre Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission



# LCZ - Local Centre Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /Assessment criteria /Vibrancy, vitality, and character of local centre; safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of the streets and public open spaces	Sera Chambers	150.191	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Local Centre Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /Assessment criteria /Quality living environments	Sera Chambers	150.192	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Local Centre Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /Assessment criteria /Function of the local centre	Sera Chambers	150.193	Amend	Considers that the assessment criteria should be amended to ensure that existing adjoining property/landowners have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Amend the assessment criteria to add that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Local Centre Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /Assessment criteria /Function of the local centre	Sera Chambers	150.194	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Local Centre Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /Assessment criteria /Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces	Sera Chambers	150.195	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Local Centre Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /Assessment criteria /Vibrancy, vitality, and character of the local centre	Sera Chambers	150.196	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Local Centre Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /Assessment criteria /Quality living environments	Sera Chambers	150.197	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Local Centre Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Rules Table /LCZ-R10: Car parking areasLCZ-R10A  LCZ-R10B	Holly Jenkins	214.3	Amend	Support standards to manage the attractiveness and interface of at grade car parking areas in commercial zones. Considers the standards fail to recognise practicalities of supermarkets and other commercial activities and that standards require a large portion of a site to be occupied for this purpose. Considers an either/or approach appropriate to achieve landscaping outcomes	Seek that the landscaping requirement of NCZ-R7; LCZ-R10; LFRZ-R3; TCZ-R7; CCZ-R6 be an either/or:  Where the car parking area is at-grade: a. a 2 m wide landscaping strip comprised of indigenous plants is provided along the full frontage of the road (except for the vehicle crossing), <del>and or</del> b. one indigenous specimen tree is provided for every ten car parks.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Standards Table /LCZ-S5: Frontages Activated streets	Holly Jenkins	214.8	Amend	Considers the need for supermarkets and other commercial activities to locate back from the street for part of a site's frontage to enable vehicle access, manoeuvring and car parking in front of the store. Considers it impractical to be completely built to the street and taking pedestrian access directly from the street and for a large portion of the building to be glazed due to heat transfer over fresh produce	Amend the standard to provide an alternative landscaping requirement along an Activated Street where it is not possible for a building to adjoin the entire length of the frontage, or provide direct pedestrian access. Amend the standard to recognise the functional and operational requirements of a supermarkets which cannot support large areas of glazing.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Rules Table /LCZ-R3: Commercial activitiesLCZ-R3A	Holly Jenkins	214.11	Amend	Considers that a Restricted Discretionary Activity status is more appropriate for larger gross floor area retail activities as the matters for consideration can be limited to the effect on existing local centres, in accordance with the purpose, objectives and policies of the Local Centre Zone.	Amend the rule as follows: LCZ:R3B: Activity status where activity conditions are not met: <del>Discretionary</del> <u>Restricted Discretionary Activity</u> <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>1. Vibrancy and vitality of the local centre</u> <u>2. Effects on the existing centres</u>	Open Submission

# LCZ - Local Centre Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Rules Table /LCZ-R13: Drive-through facilities	Anitha Premraj Sam Goddard	216.9	Amend	Supports the inclusion of drive through facilities in the Local Centre Zone (LCZ). Considers the activity is consistent with Zone objectives and that drive through restaurants should be provided for as a restricted discretionary activity.	Seeks specific provision for drive through restaurants of any size within the Local Centre Zone as a restricted discretionary activity.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Rules Table /LCZ-R12: Service stations	Shravan Miryala	217.66	Support	Supports the specific provision for service stations in the Local Centre Zone.	Retain LCZ-R12 as notified.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Rules Table /	Sean Thompson	225.9	Amend	Considers that it is not self-evident from the analysis and rationale in the proposed plan, including in terms of s 32 RMA, why relocated buildings should be classified as non-complying in the NCZ, LCZ, LFRZ, LIZ and GIZ. It is accepted that relocated buildings should be discretionary in the Natural Open Space Zone, and there may be urban design and other considerations applicable to the Town Centre Zone and City Centre Zone which warrant different treatment. Since a 2004 Central Otago Environment Court decision most local authorities in New Zealand have either adopted permitted activity classification for relocated buildings (with no standards) or provided for permitted activity status with prescribed performance standards.	Seeks for the LCZ Rules to be amended as follows: a. Provide for relocated buildings as a permitted activity in all relevant zones, excepting where a specified heritage or conservation or urban design consideration applies; b. For the relocated building rules in all zones, the removal of the requirement to deposit a monitoring fee at the same time as submitting the relocated building report; c. Amending the performance standards in relation to relocated buildings in accordance with the wording in the attached Schedule 1 (which can be found in the attached submission), to provide for: i. modification of the performance timeframes such that relocation on permanent foundation is required within two months, and twelve months is allowed for the completion of all reinstatement works; ii. provision for a pre-inspection report in the same or similar form as found in Schedule 2 (which can be found in the attached submission). Consequential or further relief including to the relevant objectives, policies and provisions of the proposed plan in order to give effect to relief sought. (The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /Objectives /LCZ-O1: Local centre function.  Relates to LCZ-I1	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.74	Amend	Seeks an amendment to explicitly recognise and provide for educational activities in the LCZ. Any zone that enables residential activities in or around it should provide for schools and day care centres as essential social infrastructure required to support the surrounding residential and commercial catchment as educational facilities do not meet the definition of community activities and should be outlined clearly here.	Seeks to Amend LCZ-O1 to recognise and provide for educational activities: LCZ-O1: Local centre function Local centres have a range of commercial and community activities, including educational activities that service the needs of the residential catchment.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /Objectives /LCZ-O4: Access and connectivity	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.75	Support	Supports this objective to enable well connected local centres through the establishment of multi-modal infrastructure. The Ministry supports the uptake of students choosing active modes of travel to schools as has health benefits and reduces traffic congestion on the road network at peak pick up and drop off time.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /Policies /LCZ-P1: Local centre function.  Relates to LCZ-O1	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.76	Amend	Seeks an amendment to explicitly recognise and provide for educational activities in the LCZ as educational facilities are necessary to service residential activities. These amendments will align with the changes requested to the correlating objective - LCZ-O1.	Seeks to Amend LCZ-P1 to recognise and provide for educational activities: LCZ-P1: Local centre function Protect the function of the local centre as a service centre for the residential catchment including by: a) providing for a range of commercial and community activities, including educational facilities, and b) restricting large format retail and industrial activities.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /Policies /LCZ-P5: Access and connectivity.  Relates to LCZ-O4	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.77	Support	Supports this objective to enable well connected local centres through the establishment of multi-modal infrastructure. The Ministry supports the uptake of students choosing active modes of travel to schools as has health benefits and reduces traffic congestion on the road network at peak pick up and drop off time.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Rules Table /LCZ-R6: Educational activities.	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.78	Amend	<p>Considers LCZ-R6 is unclear as it does not outline what the activity status would be if the educational facility could not comply with the permitted developments standards. Some matters of discretion are listed next to each development standard but nowhere in the chapter does it clearly outline that educational facilities would become a restricted discretionary activity if they cannot comply with the standards.</p> <p>The Ministry requested greater clarity is provided. The Ministry propose that a restricted discretionary status is applied to the activity status box for each educational facility. The Ministry also requests that educational facilities have their own matters of discretion, as often schools cannot comply with the development standards and matters of discretion should be restricted to the relevant effects. The matters of discretion we have proposed have been taken from other chapters in the Plan. However, if council does not support these, the Ministry would appreciate the opportunity to work with council to come to an agreement on these matters of discretion. The Ministry also request the title be changed to 'educational facilities' to be consistent with the rest of the Plan and use a term that is defined in the definitions chapter.</p>	<p>Seeks to have more clarity on LCZ-R6.</p> <p>Seeks to amend the title to read educational facilities rather than education facilities.</p> <p>Seeks to amend LCZ-R6 so that a restricted discretionary status is applied to the activity status:</p> <p>LCZ-R6: Educational facility activities Activity status: Permitted <u>Activity Status where permitted development standards are not met: Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Scale, design, layout, setbacks and screening;</u></li> <li><u>Contribution to local community wellbeing;</u></li> <li><u>Effects on the streetscape and neighbourhood character;</u></li> </ol>	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Rules Table /General	Sam Goddard	238.7	Amend	The zone provides for commercial activities however it is unclear if this includes retail activities. It is therefore considered that explicit provision should be made for supermarkets within the zone.	<p>Include specific provision for supermarkets in the Local Centre Zone with the following activity statuses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supermarkets up to 2,000m<sup>2</sup> - Permitted</li> <li>• Supermarkets over 2,000m<sup>2</sup> - Restricted Discretionary</li> </ul>	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /Objectives /General	Phil Stickney	247.32	Amend	Considers minor amendments are necessary to aid in clarity and certainty. The language used is at times vague and creates uncertainty for users of the Plan.	Amend provisions to aid in clarity and focus on salient matters clearly.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /Policies /General	Phil Stickney	247.33	Amend	Considers minor amendments are necessary to aid in clarity and certainty. The language used is at times vague and creates uncertainty for users of the Plan.	Amend provisions to aid in clarity and focus on salient matters clearly.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Rules Table /LCZ-R1: New buildings	Phil Stickney	247.34	Oppose	Considers that LCZ-R1 renders new buildings accommodating permitted activities as restricted discretionary is too restrictive. Seeks this as a permitted activity.	Amend LCZ-R1 to a Permitted Activity status if all the relevant standards can be achieved.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Rules Table /LCZ-R2: Additions and alterations	Phil Stickney	247.35	Oppose	Opposes the Restricted Discretionary Activity status for extensions to existing buildings that are over 25sqm.	Delete or amend this rule to make such activities permitted.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Rules Table /LCZ-R10: Car parking areas LCZ-R10A	Phil Stickney	247.36	Oppose	Opposes the imposition of a Restricted Discretionary consent for an at grade car park, considers this to be too restrictive.	Delete or amend this rule to make such activities Permitted.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Rules Table /General	Phil Stickney	247.37	Oppose	Opposes the lack of permitted activity rules for EV charging stations and ancillary infrastructure.	Seeks to include provision for EV charging stations and ancillary infrastructure.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /Assessment criteria /General	Phil Stickney	247.38	Oppose	Considers amendments necessary to refine and tighten the consideration of activities against the Assessment Criteria within the Plan and reflect the amendments and changes sought in this submission. In particular, it is not considered reasonably necessary for a Permitted Activity which infringes a standard in The Plan, to fall to automatically being assessed again against the relevant Objectives and Policies of The Plan as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	<p>Seeks the inclusion of more targeted Assessment Criteria that refine the scope of assessment to the range of effects that the infringement generates (either actual or potential).</p> <p>Opposes the inclusion of Plan Objectives and Policies.</p>	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /Objectives /General	Phil Stickney	263.40	Amend	Minor amendments are sought to aid in clarity and certainty. The language used is at times vague and creates uncertainty for users of the Plan.	Redraft provisions to aid in clarity and focus on salient matters clearly.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /Policies /General	Phil Stickney	263.41	Amend	Minor amendments are sought to aid in clarity and certainty. The language used is at times vague and creates uncertainty for users of the Plan.	Redraft provisions to aid in clarity and focus on salient matters clearly.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Rules Table /LCZ-R1: New buildings	Phil Stickney	263.42	Oppose	Oppose LCZ-R1 as it is considered unduly restrictive for the LCZ. On the basis that a proposed building can achieve the relevant standards set out for the Zone and presumably the standards deal with the key environmental effects to be managed, there is no compelling reason why an activity status of Restricted Discretionary is required.	Amend LCZ-R1 to a Permitted Activity status if all the relevant standards can be achieved.	Open Submission

# LCZ - Local Centre Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Rules Table /LCZ-R2: Additions and alterations	Phil Stickney	263.43	Oppose	Opposes rule LCZ-R2. This is deemed unduly restrictive given the very low threshold trigger of 25sqm. The matters for discretion are not aligned with the effects arising from, for example, an addition of 25sqm triggering a consent requirement as a restricted Discretionary Activity.	Delete or amend this rule to make such activities permitted.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Rules Table /LCZ-R10: Car parking areas LCZ-R10A	Phil Stickney	263.44	Oppose	Opposes LRZ-R10A as car parking is an essential component for the majority of local centres and given the scale of these centres and the quantum of income they generate, is almost always on grade parking. A Restricted Discretionary consent for an at grade car park is considered to be out of proportion with the nature and scale of the activity. The alternative is to place some caveats as to scale and size whereby a consent is triggered but as proposed the rule is overly harsh. It is noted that the carparking activity status of Discretionary is even more restrictive than for a new building to house a commercial activity. This rule effectively "neutralises" any of the Permitted Activities on a site by placing consenting requirements on the supporting infrastructure to allow a Permitted Activity to function effectively.	Delete or amend this rule to make such activities Permitted.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Rules Table /General	Phil Stickney	263.45	Oppose	LCZ Rules table should also include specific provision for infrastructure including EV charging facilities and any associated structures as a permitted Activity.	Include provision for, EV charging stations and ancillary infrastructure.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /Assessment criteria /General	Phil Stickney	263.46	Amend	Amendments are sought to refine and tighten the consideration of activities against the Assessment Criteria within the Plan and reflect the amendments and changes sought in this submission. In particular, it is not considered reasonably necessary for a Permitted Activity which infringes a standard in The Plan, to fall to automatically being assessed again against the relevant Objectives and Policies of The Plan as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	The Submitter seeks the inclusion of more targeted Assessment Criteria that refine the scope of assessment to the range of effects that the infringement generates (either actual or potential) rather than a wider sweep of the Plan Objectives and Policies.	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Rules Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.66	Amend	Fire and Emergency requires the ability to construct and operate emergency service facilities (i.e., fire stations) in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies. This means new fire stations may be necessary in any zone across the district in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Fire and Emergency notes that the effects of a fire station can be largely anticipated and, in the most part, do not differ to the effects of many activities that may be anticipated through rural and urban environments. Fire and Emergency requests that emergency service facilities are provided for as permitted activities in the larger, more extensive zones of the district to recognise the critical importance of emergency services to communities. In providing for emergency service facility as a permitted activity would mean that emergency service facilities would be controlled by the subsequent performance standards of each zone (such as height, height in relation to boundary, front yards, building coverage requirements).and the other relevant performance standards in other chapters (i.e., transport) to ensure that any effects are appropriately managed.	Seeks to include new permitted activity as follows: xxx-Rx: Emergency service facilities Activity Status: Permitted N/A Or To similar effect. And any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.	Open Submission



Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.85	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency’s main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</p> <p>SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB-S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.</p> <p>In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure and that new connections under the water supply bylaw will not be granted where there is insufficient capacity available within the water supply network for the proposed activity.</p>	<p>Seeks to include a new performance standard as follows:</p> <p><u>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</u></p> <p>1. All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</p> <p>2. Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</p> <p><u>Matter of discretion:</u></p> <p>1. The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.</p>	Open Submission
LCZ - Local Centre Zone /Policies /LCZ-P6: Sustainable design and infrastructure.  Relates to LCZ-05	Alec Duncan	288.132	Support	<p>Supports this policy to the extent that it seeks to ensure sufficient infrastructure provision and/or mitigation measures to meet demand, including consideration of the effects of climate change.</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

# LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table	Susan Dallas	25.17	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table	Susan Dallas	25.28	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.17	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.26	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table	Sheena McGuire	168.118	Amend	Notes that LFRZ Chapter does not contain a specific rail corridor building setback standard and there is no yard setback that applies.  Considers that setbacks are a common planning tool used to ensure the safe and efficient operation of activities such as the railway corridor, particularly when it may come into conflict with adjacent land uses. For rail, a setback provides a safe physical distance between a building and the railway corridor boundary. Heavy freight trains run on the railway lines through the Napier City District. Considers that without a sufficient setback, people painting their buildings, clearing gutters or doing works on their roof will need to access or foul the rail corridor. If a person or object encroaches onto the rail corridor, there is a substantial risk of injury or death for the person entering the rail corridor. Considers that a setback control has obvious safety benefits for the users of the land adjoining the rail corridor and users of the rail corridor. Also notes the efficiency benefits for rail operations, mitigating against the risk of train services being interrupted by unauthorised persons or objects entering the rail corridor.  Considers that without appropriate setback requirements, there is significant risk of adverse health and safety effects impacting people locating and working in proximity to the railway corridor. Seeks a new clause within LFRZ-S3 to require a 5m setback for structures and buildings from the rail corridor. Matters of discretion are also sought in the case that the setback cannot be achieved.	Amend as follows:  1. Any building or part of a building (including eaves and guttering) must not be erected closer than 20m from the Prebensen Drive and/or Severn Street boundary.  2. <u>No part of any building or structure may be located within a 5m setback from a boundary shared with a rail corridor.</u>  Matters of discretion are: 1. Amenity values 2. Character of the area, 3. <u>The safe and efficient operation of the rail network;</u> 4. <u>Compatibility with the surrounding environment; and</u> 5. The reason for the reduced setback.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table /General	Hus Narsai	205.7	Amend	Supports the provision for retail activities within the Large Format Retail zone. Considers that explicit provision should be made for trade suppliers within the zone.	Bunnings seeks for specific provision for trade suppliers in the Large Format Retail Zone with the following activity statuses: Trade suppliers with a GFA over 1,000m <sup>2</sup> – Permitted	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table	Hus Narsai	205.8	Oppose	LFRZ-R3 requires the provision of one indigenous specimen tree per 10 car parking spaces. This requirement is considered to be unnecessarily onerous given the requirement for a landscaping buffer to be provided.	Remove requirement for providing indigenous trees based on car parking spaces. This requirement does not recognise the functional and operational requirements of Bunnings with respect to the provision of car parking.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table	Hus Narsai	205.9	Oppose	Opposes the proposed restrictions on site coverage as they limit the potential scale of development and do not align with the objectives and policies of the Large Format Retail Zone, particularly LFRZ – O3 and P2. Considers there are other mechanisms to control stormwater run-off such as the provision of detention and retention.	Remove the proposed restrictions on impervious area and site intensity to provide for greater flexibility in the site layout that would better suit the functional requirements of Bunnings.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table	Hus Narsai	205.10	Oppose	Opposes the proposed restrictions on site coverage as they limit the potential scale of development and do not align with the objectives and policies of the Large Format Retail Zone, particularly LFRZ – O3 and P2. Considers there are other mechanisms to control stormwater run-off such as the provision of detention and retention.	Remove the proposed restrictions on impervious area and site intensity to provide for greater flexibility in the site layout that would better suit the functional requirements of Bunnings.	Open Submission

# LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table	Holly Jenkins	214.4	Amend	Support standards to manage the attractiveness and interface of at grade car parking areas in commercial zones. Considers the standards fail to recognise practicalities of supermarkets and other commercial activities and that standards require a large portion of a site to be occupied for this purpose. Considers an either/or approach appropriate to achieve landscaping outcomes	Seek that the landscaping requirement of NCZ-R7; LCZ-R10; LFRZ-R3; TCZ-R7; CCZ-R6 be an either/or:  1.Where the car parking area is at-grade:  a. 2 m wide landscaping strip comprised of indigenous plants is provided along the full frontage of the road (except for the vehicle crossing), and or b. one indigenous specimen tree is provided for every ten car parks.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table /General	Anitha Premraj Sam Goddard	216.3	Amend	Supports the provision for hospitality activities within the Large Format Retail zone. Considers explicit provision should be made for drive through restaurants within the zone.	Seeks for specific provision for drive through restaurants in the Large Format Retail Zone with Drive through restaurants as Permitted activity	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table	Anitha Premraj Sam Goddard	216.4	Oppose	Opposes proposed restrictions on impervious area coverage limit the potential scale of development. Considers that the provisions fail to align with the objectives and policies of the Large Format Retail Zone, LFRZ – O3 and P2	Delete the proposed restriction on the impervious area coverage to provide for greater flexibility in the type of activities within the LFRZ	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table /	Sean Thompson	225.10	Amend	Considers that it is not self-evident from the analysis and rationale in the proposed plan, including in terms of s 32 RMA, why relocated buildings should be classified as non-complying in the NCZ, LCZ, LFRZ, LIZ and GIZ. It is accepted that relocated buildings should be discretionary in the Natural Open Space Zone, and there may be urban design and other considerations applicable to the Town Centre Zone and City Centre Zone which warrant different treatment.  Since a 2004 Central Otago Environment Court decision most local authorities in New Zealand have either adopted permitted activity classification for relocated buildings (with no standards) or provided for permitted activity status with prescribed performance standards.	Seeks to amend the LFRZ Rule as follows:  a. Provide for relocated buildings as a permitted activity in all relevant zones, excepting where a specified heritage or conservation or urban design consideration applies; b. For the relocated building rules in all zones, the removal of the requirement to deposit a monitoring fee at the same time as submitting the relocated building report; c. Amending the performance standards in relation to relocated buildings in accordance with the wording in the attached Schedule 1 (which can be found in the attached submission), to provide for: i. modification of the performance timeframes such that relocation on permanent foundation is required within two months, and twelve months is allowed for the completion of all reinstatement works; ii. provision for a pre-inspection report in the same or similar form as found in Schedule 2 (which can be found in the attached submission).  Consequential or further relief including to the relevant objectives, policies and provisions of the proposed plan in order to give effect to relief sought.  (The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table /General	Sam Goddard	238.8	Amend	Supports the provision for retail activities within the Large Format Retail zone however, it is considered that explicit provision should be made for supermarkets within the zone.	Include specific provision for supermarkets in the Large Format Retail Zone with the following activity statuses:  Supermarkets with a GFA over 1,000m <sup>2</sup> - Permitted	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table	Sam Goddard	238.9	Oppose	Submitter acknowledges the need to manage infrastructure demands resulting from development within the Large Format Retail Zone. However, opposes as the proposed restrictions on site intensity limit the potential scale of development and are not considered to align with the objectives and policies of the Large Format Retail Zone, particularly LFRZ – O3 and P2. Considers that there are other mechanisms to control stormwater run-off such as the provision of detention and retention for example.	Delete the proposed restrictions on the impervious area and site intensity to provide for greater flexibility in the site layout that would better suit the functional requirements of the submitter.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table	Sam Goddard	238.10	Oppose	Submitter acknowledges the need to manage infrastructure demands resulting from development within the Large Format Retail Zone, however, opposes the proposed restrictions on site intensity limit the potential scale of development and are not considered to align with the objectives and policies of the Large Format Retail Zone, particularly LFRZ – O3 and P2. Considers that there are other mechanisms to control stormwater run-off such as the provision of detention and retention for example.	Delete the proposed restrictions on the impervious area and site intensity to provide for greater flexibility in the site layout that would better suit the functional requirements of the submitter.	Open Submission

# LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table	Phil Stickney	263.47	Oppose	Amend Rule LFR-R1 and 2 as this provision is considered to be too blunt in its current form and on larger sites limits development opportunities for LFR sites. While the range of tenancies can be broadened under Rule LFRZ-R1A (2), it is noted that the corresponding "broadening up" of the mix of tenancy sizes is not replicated in LFRZ-R2A.	Amend LFRZ-R1A to enable a greater range of smaller tenancies as part of an LFR development. Set the minimum GFA at 800sqm. Amend LFRZ-R1A (2) to 40%	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table	Phil Stickney	263.48	Oppose	Amend Rule LFR-R1 and 2 as this provision is considered to be too blunt in its current form and on larger sites limits development opportunities for LFR sites. While the range of tenancies can be broadened under Rule LFRZ-R1A (2), it is noted that the corresponding "broadening up" of the mix of tenancy sizes is not replicated in LFRZ-R2A.  A corresponding amendment to allow for situations where larger sites are enabled to accommodate a larger range of hospitality facilities to cater for the typical demands and market sectors arising from a an LFR retail complex. That is not considered to have a significant potential for an adverse impact on the CBD core given the type, nature, and operating model of the typical; hospitality establishments in such LFR developments are not usually wanting to establish within a CBD type environment. Changes to the scale and number of such developments are sought including recognition of drive-thru establishments as being a suitable activity within the LFRZ.		Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table	Phil Stickney	263.49	Oppose	Oppose LFRZ-R3A as it is considered overly restrictive and onerous. A departure from landscape standards and the particular palette of planting required is not a matter that should be considered as a discretionary activity if not adhered to.	Delete or amend this rule to give effect to the relief sought.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table NA	Phil Stickney	263.50	Oppose	Oppose Rule LFRZ-R5 as it imposes a blanket coverage rule. The proposed rule is blunt and does not reflect the fact that the site development will be required to manage stormwater by way of quantifiable modelling and engineering design to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse environmental effects. The net result is to restrict development in an efficient manner on a scare land resource in Napier.	Delete the coverage requirements.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table /General	Phil Stickney	263.51	Oppose	Seeks amendment to the LFRZ rules table to include express recognition of ancillary offices or similar supporting activities within the Rules to ensure clarity, and to recognise the fundamental role of ancillary facilities and also complementary aspect of LFR activities but are not currently captured within the definition of retail activity per say.	Include provision and recognition for offices ancillary to a retail operation.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table /General	Phil Stickney	263.52	Oppose	The provision of supporting and complementary activities including service stations / EV car recharge stations are also expected within an LFRZ and are an expected aspect of the land use range in the context of an automobile driven form of retailing. These are currently not provided for within the LFRZ noting that a definition of service station is already contained within the Plan.	Include provision for service stations, EV charging stations and ancillary infrastructure.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table	Phil Stickney	263.53	Oppose	Opposes a blanket standard in LFR-S4 and LFR-S5 as it is blunt and does not reflect the fact that the site development will be required to manage stormwater by way of quantifiable modelling and engineering design to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse environmental effects. The net result is to restrict development in an efficient manner on a scare land resource in Napier.	Delete the rule.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table	Phil Stickney	263.54	Oppose	Opposes the blanket standard in LFR-S4 and LFR-S5 as it is blunt and does not reflect the fact that the site development will be required to manage stormwater by way of quantifiable modelling and engineering design to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse environmental effects. The net result is to restrict development in an efficient manner on a scare land resource in Napier.	Delete the rule.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /Assessment criteria /General	Phil Stickney	263.55	Amend	Amend assessment criteria to refine and tighten the consideration of activities against the Assessment Criteria within the Plan and reflect the amendments and changes sought in this submission. In particular, it is not considered reasonably necessary for a Permitted Activity which infringes a standard in The Plan, to fall to automatically being assessed again against the relevant Objectives and Policies of The Plan as a restricted Discretionary Activity.	Seeks the inclusion of more targeted Assessment Criteria that refine the scope of assessment to the range of effects that the infringement generates (either actual or potential) rather than a wider sweep of the Plan Objectives and Policies.	Open Submission

# LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /Issues /LFRZ-I3: Traffic generation and demand on infrastructure services	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.135	Support	Supports I3, O5 and P4 as they recognize that large retail developments can have significant transport generation and effects on the transport network and encourage sufficient infrastructure provisions or mitigation measures.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /Objectives /LFRZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.136	Support	Supports I3, O5 and P4 as they recognize that large retail developments can have significant transport generation and effects on the transport network and encourage sufficient infrastructure provisions or mitigation measures.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /Policies /LFRZ-P4: Sustainable design and infrastructure	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.137	Support	Supports I3, O5 and P4 as they recognize that large retail developments can have significant transport generation and effects on the transport network and encourage sufficient infrastructure provisions or mitigation measures.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.67	Amend	<p>re and Emergency requires the ability to construct and operate emergency service facilities (i.e., fire stations) in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies. This means new fire stations may be necessary in any zone across the district in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the effects of a fire station can be largely anticipated and, in the most part, do not differ to the effects of many activities that may be anticipated through rural and urban environments.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency requests that emergency service facilities are provided for as permitted activities in the larger, more extensive zones of the district to recognise the critical importance of emergency services to communities. In providing for emergency service facility as a permitted activity would mean that emergency service facilities would be controlled by the subsequent performance standards of each zone (such as height, height in relation to boundary, front yards, building coverage requirements).and the other relevant performance standards in other chapters (i.e., transport) to ensure that any effects are appropriately managed.</p>	<p>Seeks to include new permitted activity as follows:</p> <p><b>xxx-Rx: Emergency service facilities</b>  <b>Activity Status: Permitted</b></p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.</p>	Open Submission

# LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.86	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency’s main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</p> <p>SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB-S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.</p> <p>In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure and that new connections under the water supply bylaw will not be granted where there is insufficient capacity available within the water supply network for the proposed activity.</p>	<p>To include a new performance standard as follows:</p> <p>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</p> <p>1. All new developments must be connected to a public <u>reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u></p> <p>2. <u>Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p>Matter of discretion:</p> <p>1. <u>The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.</p>	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /Policies /LFRZ-P4: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Alec Duncan	288.133	Support	Supports this policy to the extent that it seeks to ensure sufficient infrastructure provision and/or mitigation measures to meet demand, including consideration of the effects of climate change.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

# MUZ - Mixed Use Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S14: Fences and walls	Susan Dallas	25.14	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S14: Fences and walls	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.14	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Issues /MUZ-I1: Mix of activities	John Sandall	85.1	Oppose	Opposes the General Industrial Zone over Ahuriri. Seeking this area be rezoned to Mixed Use Zone.	Amend the Ahuriri General Industrial Zone to Mixed Use Zone.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R5: Residential activity	Andrea Millar	105.17	Support	Supports the permitted activity rules applying to "residential activity" in the zone as appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided by Ara Poutama.	Retain permitted activity rule MUZ-R5 applying to "residential activities" in the Mixed Use Zone.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /General	Andrea Millar	105.19	Oppose	Opposes the activity rules applying to community corrections activity" as they do not enable community corrections activities, and provides non-complying activity status for these activities in the zone under MUZ-R17. Considers the importance of Community corrections activities and the need to enable non-custodial community corrections sites including within the zone which is easily accessible to offenders, where commercial, community and other similar activities are enabled as of right, often provide suitable sites for community work activities, including larger site sizes for yard-based activities and large equipment and/or vehicle storage.	Amend to insert a new permitted activity rule for "community corrections activities" in the Mixed Use Zone, as follows:  <u>MUZ-RX: Community corrections activities</u> <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u> <u>NA</u>	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Assessment criteria /MUZ-AC1: New buildings not meeting permitted standards (MUZ-R1)	Pip Beachen	142.10	Oppose	Opposes the introduction of the Hastings Residential Intensification Design Guide into the statutory assessment process. Considers it is a useful tool to achieve quality design outcomes, however would introduce an additional layer of subjectivity and uncertainty. Seeks its retention as a non-statutory guidance document only, with resource consents to be assessed against concise 'material' development criteria in the District Plan.	Delete assessment Criteria MUZ-AC1(b), (i) and (j). Retain the remaining assessment criteria for new buildings being (a), (c) – (h).	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S6: Impervious area	Pip Beachen	142.45	Amend	Considers that Most of the sites within the proposed Mixed Use Zone are currently covered by 100% impervious surfaces. Opposes this standard in its current form as it places further restriction on sites compared to their existing situation. The stormwater rules will apply to any additional impervious area in this zone which will assist in managing stormwater discharge to the network without needing to further restrict impervious areas in this zone.	Amend to provide for 100% impervious area.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S7: Landscaped area	Pip Beachen	142.46	Oppose	Opposes as very few sites within the proposed Mixed Use Zone area have any landscaping currently. Considers that requiring 20% landscaping is a significant and onerous change to how these sites can be developed. Considers that landscape and streetscape character outcomes are better addressed through the Yards and Frontages Rules as they have been applied in Standards MUZ-S3 and MUZ-S4 respectively	Delete this landscaping requirement to better reflect the existing character of the sites within this zone.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S8: Open space	Pip Beachen	142.47	Oppose	Opposes the wording of MUZ-S8(3) and seeks further clarity around the interpretation of this standard.	Amend or delete MUZ-S8(3) as further clarity is required.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S13: Garages	Pip Beachen	142.48	Oppose	Opposes this standard as notified as it has the potential to significantly restrict the ability to provide two-three level terraced houses facing the street, which may limit the viability of achieving this form. Considers that the standard will produce generic outcomes providing for facades with no modulation. Design assessment criteria can address the relationship of dwellings to the street without requiring this restrictive control.	Delete MUZ-S13.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /General	Pip Beachen	142.58	Amend	Considers that it is important that the standards appropriately facilitate the outcomes sought by Council for the City and further enable efficient development of sites while achieving onsite amenity and maintain an appropriate and transparent standard of amenity for adjacent residents. Seeks to ensure that the standards across the relevant zones (GRZ, MRZ, HRZ, MUZ) are workable and provide for practical outcomes when actually implemented onsite.	Seeks that standards across the relevant zones (GRZ, MRZ, HRZ, MUZ) are workable and provide for practical outcomes when actually implemented onsite. Seeks Amendments or the removal of standards which are overly onerous for residential development or which result in contradicting outcomes to other standards, therefore seeking a consistent approach within each Zone and across the Plan.	Open Submission

# MUZ - Mixed Use Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S3: Yards	Sheena McGuire	168.119	Amend	Notes that MUZ Chapter does not contain a specific rail corridor building setback standard and there is no yard setback that applies to the corridor. In the case of rail, a setback provides a safe physical distance between a building and the railway corridor boundary. Heavy freight trains run on the railway lines through the Napier City District. Without a sufficient setback, people painting their buildings, clearing gutters or doing works on their roof will need to access or foul the rail corridor. Considers that if a person or object encroaches onto the rail corridor, there is a substantial risk of injury or death for the person entering the rail corridor. A setback control has obvious safety benefits for the users of the land adjoining the rail corridor and users of the rail corridor. Also notes the efficiency benefits for rail operations, by mitigating against the risk of train services being interrupted by unauthorised persons or objects entering the rail corridor. Considers that without appropriate setback requirements, there is significant risk of adverse health and safety effects impacting people locating and working in proximity to the railway corridor. Seeks a new clause within MUZ-S3 to require a 5m setback for structures and buildings from the rail corridor. Matters of discretion are also sought in the case that the setback cannot be achieved.	Amend as follows: 1. There is no front yard requirement, except that a minimum 3m landscaped yard comprised of indigenous plants is required where sites: a. front onto Pandora Road, and b. adjoin a site that is zoned Residential. 2. There is no side or rear yard requirement, except that no part of any building must be located within 6 m of a residential zone site boundary or Tyne Street drain. 3. <u>No part of any building or structure may be located within a 5m setback from a boundary shared with a rail corridor.</u> Matters of discretion are: 1. Purpose of the standard; 2. Quality living environments; 3. Amenity values; 4. Character of the area; 5. Operation and maintenance of watercourses and open	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R1: New buildings	Cameron Drury	179.2	Oppose	It seems nonsensical to limit the gross floor area of new buildings to 400m2. There is no specific policy support for this, while a limit of 400m2 risks implementation of MUZ-P1.	Delete Rule	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R3: Commercial activity outside the city centre fringe control area	Cameron Drury	179.3	Amend	Make changes to this rule to improve clarity and avoid stand alone commercial, office accommodation or retail activities falling to be assessed as a non-complying activity under MUZ-R17.	Insert new Rule to provide for office accommodation and retail activities within limits as a Permitted Activity in a similar manner as PREC10-R2A.  Amend the activity description of MUZ-R3A as follows:  <u>Commercial Activity (including office accommodation and retail activities) outside the city center fringe control area'</u>  Or  Insert new rule to provide for commercial office accommodation and retail activities not otherwise provided for under Rule MUZ-R3A and the new permitted activity rule as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /	Cameron Drury	179.4	Amend	The zone should provide for Hospitality activities without these falling to be assessed as a non-complying activity under MUZ-R17.	Insert new rule to provide for Hospitality activities as a Permitted Activity where appropriate and as Restricted Discretionary Activity otherwise.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S3: Yards	Cameron Drury	179.13	Oppose	MUZ-S3(2) - A 6m set back from a residential site boundary does not enable optimal use of a site and is considered excessive to maintaining residential amenity when a MUZ-S2 would apply (height in relation to boundary)	Reduce to setback 1 m.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S8: Open space	Cameron Drury	179.14	Oppose	MUZ-S8(3) - Seems excessive for when higher density is encouraged and also impractical for open space areas above ground floors. This rule is also less important in Hawkes Bay than other areas of the country. Shaded outdoor areas can be valuable during the summer.	Amend or delete the requirement for open space to not be south facing.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S9: Residential Outlook space	Cameron Drury	179.15	Oppose	Seems excessive for when higher density is encouraged.	Amend or delete and place as an Assessment Criteria.	Open Submission



# MUZ - Mixed Use Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S12: Storage of shipping containers	Cameron Drury	179.16	Oppose	Likely to only allow a single shipping container. In a zone where light industry is provided for the stacking of two shipping containers would not be unreasonable and would be lesser in height than a new building complying with the height limit which may have more significant effects.	Amend the height limit to allow the stacking of two shipping containers.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S13: Garages	Cameron Drury	179.17	Oppose	MUZ-13(2)-(3) - Compromises variety in design – risks straight facades with no modulation.	Consider the best tool to achieve the outcome sought and make provision for narrow lots. This may include deleting the standard and relying on assessment criteria for multi-unit developments, or amendments to the standard.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S14: Fences and walls	Cameron Drury	179.18	Amend	The purpose relates only to residential activities but would otherwise apply to every activity.	Amend to apply to only residential activities.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Assessment criteria /MUZ-AC1: New buildings not meeting permitted standards (MUZ-R1)	Cameron Drury	179.20	Oppose	Consequential amendment - Not necessary with Rule MUZ-R1 deleted.	Delete	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Assessment criteria /MUZ-AC1: New buildings not meeting permitted standards (MUZ-R1)	Cameron Drury	179.21	Oppose	Criteria (b) refers to the Hastings Residential Intensification Design Guide. This should not apply to non-residential buildings.	Amend to not apply to non-residential buildings.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /General	Hus Narsai	205.11	Amend	Supports the provision for retail activities within the Mixed Use zone. Considers that explicit provision should be made for trade suppliers within the zone.	Bunnings seeks for specific provision for trade suppliers in the Large Format Retail Zone with the following activity statuses:  Trade suppliers – Restricted Discretionary	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S5: Building coverage	Hus Narsai	205.12	Oppose	Proposed restrictions on building coverage, impervious area and landscaped area as they limit the potential scale of development. There are other mechanisms to control stormwater run-off such as the provision of detention and retention for example.	Remove the proposed restrictions on building coverage, impervious area and landscaped area to provide for greater flexibility in the site layout that would better suit functional requirements of Bunnings.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S6: Impervious area	Hus Narsai	205.13	Oppose	Proposed restrictions on building coverage, impervious area and landscaped area as they limit the potential scale of development. There are other mechanisms to control stormwater run-off such as the provision of detention and retention for example.	Remove the proposed restrictions on building coverage, impervious area and landscaped area to provide for greater flexibility in the site layout that would better suit functional requirements of Bunnings.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S7: Landscaped area	Hus Narsai	205.14	Oppose	Proposed restrictions on building coverage, impervious area and landscaped area as they limit the potential scale of development. There are other mechanisms to control stormwater run-off such as the provision of detention and retention for example.	Remove the proposed restrictions on building coverage, impervious area and landscaped area to provide for greater flexibility in the site layout that would better suit functional requirements of Bunnings.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Issues /MUZ-I1: Mix of activities	Georgina McPherson	215.134	Support	The Fuel Companies are generally supportive of this Issue	Retain MUZ-I1 as notified.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Issues /MUZ-I2: Effects on the community and the economic function of centres	Georgina McPherson	215.135	Support	The Fuel Companies are generally supportive of this Issue.	Retain MUZ-I2 as notified.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Objectives /MUZ-O1: Mixed use of activities	Georgina McPherson	215.136	Support	MUZ-O1 is generally supported by the Fuel Companies.	Retain MUZ-O1 as notified.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Objectives /MUZ-O3: Effects on the community and economic function of centres	Georgina McPherson	215.137	Support	MUZ-O3 is generally supported by the Fuel Companies.	Retain MUZ-O3 as notified.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Policies /MUZ-P1: Mix of activities	Georgina McPherson	215.138	Amend	MUZ-P1 is generally supported by the Fuel Companies. However, in providing a compatible mix of activities within the zone, as sought by MUZ-P1, it is important to avoid or manage the potential for reverse sensitivity effects arising.	Amend MUZ-P1 as follows:  MUZ-P1: Mix of activities  Encourage a compatible mix of activities within the zone by:  a. providing for ...  d. avoiding new heavy industry activities, <u>and</u>  e. avoiding or managing potential reverse sensitivity <u>effects</u> .	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R12: Industrial activity	Georgina McPherson	215.139	Support	The Fuel Companies support the permissiveness of this Rule to the extent that it is applicable to land zoned MUZ at the terminals. The rule should be retained.	Retain MUZ-R12 as notified.	Open Submission

# MUZ - Mixed Use Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R16: Service stations, transport depots, drive-through facilities	Georgina McPherson	215.140	Oppose	<p>As a commercial and retail activity, it is inappropriate to treat Service stations differently to other commercial and retail activities. This is considered to be unduly restrictive.</p> <p>In relation to meeting the MUZ standards on a permitted activity, the Fuel Companies query the appropriateness and reasonableness of setting an impervious area threshold through the impervious area standard MUZ-S6 where stormwater runoff is appropriately managed as paving of surfaces can be an appropriate means of managing the risks associated with HAIL sites and contaminated soils. Restrictions relating to impervious areas is a stormwater matter, and these matters are already dealt with in the Proposed Plan under the stormwater (SW) chapter, Part 2 – District Wide Matters and do not need to be duplicated. See full submission for more detail.</p> <p>For similar reasons, it is unreasonable to expect existing fully developed sites to achieve the minimum landscaping standard in MUZ-S7.</p> <p>For these reasons the (permitted) service station rule should not be subject to standards MUZ-S6 or MUZ-S7. In the alternative, these standards should be deleted from the zone.</p>	<p>Amend rule MUZ-R16 as follows:</p> <p>MUZ-R16: <del>Service stations, transport depots,</del> drive-through facilities</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add a new permitted rule for service stations as follows:</p> <p><u>MUZ-RX: Service stations MUZ-RXA</u></p> <p><u>Activity status: Permitted</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>1. The activity complies with standards MUZ-S1 to MUZ-S5 and MUZ-S11 to MUZ-S14.</u></p> <p><u>MUZ-RXB</u></p> <p><u>Activity status where standards are not met:</u></p> <p><u>Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u></p> <p><u>The matters of discretion stated for the relevant MUZ standard(s).</u></p>	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Assessment criteria /General	Georgina McPherson	215.141	Support	The Fuel Companies support the assessment criteria for the Mixed Use Zone and seek that they are retained.	Retain assessment criteria for the Mixed Use Zone.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R16: Service stations, transport depots, drive-through facilities	Anitha Premraj Sam Goddard	216.5	Amend	Supports the specific provision for drive through facilities within the Mixed-Use Zone. Considered that the discretionary activity status proposed is restrictive as this activity is compatible with objectives, policies, and the other activities provided for in the zone	Seeks specific provision for drive through restaurants in the Mixed-Use Zone as a permitted activity.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S5: Building coverage	Anitha Premraj Sam Goddard	216.6	Oppose	Considers activities accommodated within the MUZ include commercial and light industrial activities that may require a site arrangement with a greater level of flexibility than is currently provided in the PDP.	Delete the proposed restrictions on site coverages to provide for greater flexibility in the format of development on the site.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S6: Impervious area	Anitha Premraj Sam Goddard	216.7	Oppose	Considers activities accommodated within the MUZ include commercial and light industrial activities that may require a site arrangement with a greater level of flexibility than is currently provided in the PDP.	Delete the proposed restrictions on site coverages to provide for greater flexibility in the format of development on the site.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S7: Landscaped area	Anitha Premraj Sam Goddard	216.8	Oppose	Considers activities accommodated within the MUZ include commercial and light industrial activities that may require a site arrangement with a greater level of flexibility than is currently provided in the PDP.	Delete the proposed restrictions on site coverages to provide for greater flexibility in the format of development on the site.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Objectives /MUZ-O1: Mixed use of activities	Shravan Miryala	217.19	Support	Supports MUZ-O1	Retain MUZ-O1 as notified.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Objectives /MUZ-O3: Effects on the community and economic function of centres	Shravan Miryala	217.20	Support	Supports MUZ-O3	Retain MUZ-O3 as notified.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Objectives /MUZ-O5: Access and connectivity	Shravan Miryala	217.21	Support	Supports MUZ-O5	Retain MUZ-O5 as notified.	Open Submission

# MUZ - Mixed Use Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Policies /MUZ-P1: Mix of activities	Shravan Miryala	217.22	Amend	Supports the intent to encourage a mix of activities within the Zone. Considers that the amenity of more sensitive activities, such as residential activities (which are enabled in this zone), will be better protected where they have been appropriately designed to manage reverse sensitivity effects where there is an interface with lawfully established non-residential activities. Notes that the relief sought is consistent with design principle 1: The Site of the National medium density design guide (Ministry for the Environment, May 2022) which seeks that current or proposed nearby non-residential activities are identified and that residential development responds to them.	Amend MUZ-P1 as follows:  Encourage a compatible mix of activities within the zone by: a. providing for the operational requirements of light industry whilst ensuring a reasonable level of amenity for sensitive uses within the Mixed Use Zone and adjacent Residential Zones; b. limiting retail and office activity to ensure that the function, role and amenity of the City Centre Zone and other centres are not compromised; c. enabling residential, recreational, and/or community activities outside of identified areas of risk, <del>and</del> d. avoiding new heavy industry activities., <u>and</u> <u>e. managing reverse sensitivity at zone interfaces and the interface between existing non-residential and noise-sensitive activities</u>	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Policies /MUZ-P2: Quality living environments	Shravan Miryala	217.23	Amend	Supports Policy MUZ-P2 and the recognition of the range of activities that can occur appropriately in the Zone, including consideration of the existing environment, however, considers the focus should more appropriately be on achieving the intent of the zone while recognising the existing environment.	Amend Policy MUZ-P2 as follows:  Enable residential developments and conversions of existing buildings in the Mixed Use Zone outside of identified areas of risk while managing development to achieve a reasonable standard of amenity for residents., <u>while recognising the existing environment.</u>	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R16: Service stations, transport depots, drive-through facilities	Shravan Miryala	217.24	Oppose	Notes that service stations encompass both commercial and retail activities, permitted within the city center fringe control area (MUZ-R4), which also allows for industrial activities (MUZ-R12). Despite the range of permitted activities within the zone, submitter considers that service stations being classified as discretionary activities for new developments or alterations to existing ones is overly restrictive. Notes that the mixed use zone provides for a compatible mixture of residential, commercial, light industrial, recreational and/or community activities. Considers that service stations are compatible with a range of other mixed-use activities and function appropriately within a mixed use environment such that a permitted status, subject to appropriate development standards, is the most appropriate outcome for managing land use effects and giving effect to the suite of objectives and policies of this zone.  Notes that part of the Z Terminal site in Ahuriri is zoned MUZ zone and used for a transport depot for which the discretionary activity status is also considered to be unduly restrictive.	Amend rule MUZ-R16 to delete the applicability to service stations and transport depots, and Add a new permitted activity rule for service stations and transport depots where MUZ-S1 to MUZ-S5 and MUZ-S11 to MUZ-S14 are met. Not meeting the standards to default to restricted discretionary activity.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S4: Frontages	Shravan Miryala	217.25	Amend	Notes that standard MUZ-S4 requires that, where a building is not located along the street frontage, a landscape buffer of 2 m in depth must be provided where landscaping is comprised of a mix of trees and plants etc. Considers that in all cases the buildings at service stations (existing, new or alterations to existing) will not be located along the street frontage due to functionality and operational safety needs. Notes that any changes to existing service stations or the south-end of the Terminal will have to consider this standard which is not necessarily currently achieved at the sites identified above in the MUZ. Considers this unachievable for a number of functional requirement reasons, including traffic safety. MU Zoning of the southern part of the Terminal (adjacent to Battery Road), if developed to achieve this standard (particularly the buildings on the frontage), may create an incongruous development when considered in the context of Battery Road, a mainly residential road. Considers that for service station sites incorporating trees into front boundary landscaping is problematic. Seeks to clarify if the 'or' in the following aspect of the Standard is intentional and whether the landscaping could be low planting not requiring only trees, but needs to be a mix.	Amend Standard MUZ-S4 to exclude existing service station sites from meeting these requirements; and to clarify the landscaping requirements through introduction of "or" in the list.	Open Submission

# MUZ - Mixed Use Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S7: Landscaped area	Shravan Miryala	217.26	Amend	Notes that standard MUZ-S7 requires all Landscaped areas to be a minimum of 20% of the net site area. Notes that any changes to existing service stations will have to consider this standard which is not currently achieved at the site identified above in the MUZ. It is unlikely to be achievable for a number of functional requirement reasons, including traffic safety. Opposes the imposition of this standard to existing service stations sites. Acknowledges landscaping up to 20% of the site can enhance the attractiveness of a site and mitigate the effects of the development of the site. Service station sites have a significant number of traffic movements into and out of the site per day and, where movement within and visibility to the forecourt and to signage is critical to a successful and safe operation, the extent to which an existing service station can be landscaped is usually extremely limited. Considers that Small scale changes to an existing service station should therefore not need to be assessed against this standard, where lawfully existing.	Amend Standard MUZ-S7 to exclude existing service station sites from the landscaping requirements. This could be achieved by including the following additional exemption to the standard:  1. Landscaped area must be a minimum of 20% of the net site area.  <u>Except where:</u>  <u>a. the site is utilised by a lawfully established existing service station activity.</u>	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone //	Frank Spencer	223.1	Amend	considers the following:  1. The scale restrictions and adjunct use requirements for commercial, office and retail activities is outdated and does not reflect the potential implied and by the Mixed Use Zone 2. The scale restrictions for Residential care and day care and visitor accommodation and education are outdated and fail to match the potential development demand. 3. Entertainment facilities are restricted activity, but there is no definition of Entertainment facilities. 4. Hospitality is dominant in Ahuriri but is not provided for as a permitted activity. 5. Healthcare ought to be a permitted activity rather than Restricted Discretionary 6. Building coverage should remain at 75% 7. The provision relating to open space for South facing residential developments is a non-sensical provision. 8. Residential outlook provisions need further consideration. 9. Container storage needs to accommodate at least three containers in a vertical stack. 10. Greater clarity around stormwater attenuation and disposal required.	seeks a review to consider more pragmatic provisions	Open Submission

# MUZ - Mixed Use Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R2: Relocated Buildings	Sean Thompson	225.11	Amend	Considers that it is not self-evident from the analysis and rationale in the proposed plan, including in terms of s 32 RMA, why relocated buildings should be classified as non-complying in the NCZ, LCZ, LFRZ, LIZ and GIZ. It is accepted that relocated buildings should be discretionary in the Natural Open Space Zone, and there may be urban design and other considerations applicable to the Town Centre Zone and City Centre Zone which warrant different treatment. Since a 2004 Central Otago Environment Court decision most local authorities in New Zealand have either adopted permitted activity classification for relocated buildings (with no standards) or provided for permitted activity status with prescribed performance standards.	Seeks to amend the Relocated Buildings Activity Rules as follows: a. Provide for relocated buildings as a permitted activity (like MUZ) in all relevant zones, excepting where a specified heritage or conservation or urban design consideration applies; b. For the relocated building rules in all zones, the removal of the requirement to deposit a monitoring fee at the same time as submitting the relocated building report; c. Amending the performance standards in relation to relocated buildings in accordance with the wording in the attached Schedule 1 (which can be found in the attached submission), to provide for: i. modification of the performance timeframes such that relocation on permanent foundation is required within two months, and twelve months is allowed for the completion of all reinstatement works; ii. provision for a pre-inspection report in the same or similar form as found in Schedule 2 (which can be found in the attached submission). iii. For relocated buildings in the Light Industrial Zone and General Industrial Zone, the further amendment of performance standards removing the need for a pre-inspection report and monitoring fee.  Consequential or further relief including to the relevant objectives, policies and provisions of the proposed plan in order to give effect to relief sought.  (The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Objectives /General	Alicia McKinnon	230.5	Support	Supports the proposed objectives and policies for the (MUZ) - Mixed Use Zone (with the emphasis upon redrawing the MUZ on the Planning Maps as per the submission) because they aim to provide for a balance between residential, commercial, light industrial and recreational activities.	Retain the wording of the Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) objectives and policies.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Policies /General	Alicia McKinnon	230.6	Support	Supports the proposed objectives and policies for the Mixed Use Zone (with the emphasis upon redrawing the MUZ on the Planning Maps as per the submission) because they aim to provide for a balance between residential, commercial, light industrial and recreational activities.	Retain the wording of the (MUZ) Mixed Use Zone objectives and policies.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R12: Industrial activity	Alicia McKinnon	230.7	Support	Supports that industrial activity is a permitted activity where the industrial activity is one of the following activities:  a) Light manufacturing and servicing; b) Repair and maintenance services, and c) Warehousing and storage.  Supports the move to greater specify the types of industrial activities which are permitted in the Mixed Use Zone and to have a discretionary rule (MUZ-R12B) where activity status conditions are not met in MUZ-R12A.  The Rules should apply to the proposed amended area of the MUZ as per the submission content concerning the PDP Planning Maps.  This will likely provide for greater abilities to control the types of activities that can enter the Mixed Use Zone, thereby helping to minimise negative effects on residential amenity.	Retain the wording of Rules MUZ-R12A and MUZ-R12B.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R16: Service stations, transport depots, drive-through facilities	Alicia McKinnon	230.8	Support	Considers that service stations, transport depots, drive-through facilities having a discretionary activity status is supported (with the rules also applying to the redrawn proposed MUZ area in the submission) with this provision remaining the same as it is in the Operative District Plan.	Retain the wording of MUZ-R16.	Open Submission

# MUZ - Mixed Use Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S1: Height	Alicia McKinnon	230.10	Amend	There should be no increase to the height rule for the Mixed Use Zone.  The current height rule of 12 metres in the Napier Operative District Plan for the Mixed Use Zone must be retained to ensure amenity values are not further eroded through time.	seeks to amend MUZ-S1 as follows:  Buildings and structure must not exceed <del>24</del> <u>12</u> m in height	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S12: Storage of shipping containers	Alicia McKinnon	230.11	Amend	Shipping containers were previously stored at 85 Battery Road and this activity had significant adverse effects on residential amenity, mainly from the noise generated from moving containers.  Considers that the operating hours for the delivery or movement of shipping containers should be constrained in the Mixed Use Zone.	seeks to amend MUZ-S12 as follows:  1. The outdoor storage (including the repair and distribution) of shipping containers must not exceed a height of 3 m. 2. <u>Operating hours for the delivery or movement of shipping containers are between 8am and 10pm on the same day.</u>	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Objectives /MUZ-O1: Mixed use of activities	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.79	Amend	Amend MUZ-O1 to include educational facilities. As any zone that enables residential activities should provide for schools and day care centres as well to support the residential and commercial catchment.	Seeks to amend MUZ-O1 to include educational facilities:  Mixed use of activities  A mix of compatible residential, commercial, light industrial, recreational and/or community activities, <u>including educational facilities</u> are able to establish and operate.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Policies /MUZ-P1: Mix of activities	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.80	Amend	Amend MUZ-P1 so that educational facilities are explicitly provided for. Any zone that enables residential activities in or around it should provide for schools and day care centres as essential social infrastructure required to support the surrounding residential and commercial catchment.  The changes align with the changes requested on the correlating objective - MUZ-O1	Seeks to amend MUZ-P1 to include educational facilities:  MUZ-P1: Mix of activities  Encourage a compatible mix of activities within the zone by:  a) providing for the operational requirements of light industry whilst ensuring a reasonable level of amenity for sensitive uses within the Mixed Use Zone and adjacent Residential Zones;  b) limiting retail and office activity to ensure that the function, role and amenity of the City Centre Zone and other centres are not compromised;  c) enabling residential, recreational, and/or community activities, <u>including educational facilities</u> outside of identified areas of risk, and  d) avoiding new heavy industry activities.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R8: Day care centres	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.81	Oppose	Opposes MUZ-R8, Day care centres are included within the definition of educational facilities as childcare services. Therefore, this activity status is a duplication of MUZ-R10A which also provides for daycare centres as permitted activity if they have less than 10 people. Recommends this activity status is removed; any daycare centre can apply for the same activity through MUZ-R10A.	Seeks to Delete MUZ-R8.	Open Submission

# MUZ - Mixed Use Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R10: Educational facility	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.82	Amend	<p>Amend MUZ-R10A to provide for educational facilities, such as childcare services for up to 50 students as a permitted activity. states this would better align with the typical sizes of pre-school facilities in either established buildings or in new-builds as well as the Ministry's pre-school license requirements. This also recognises the accepted actual effects of these facilities as established in the Mixed Use Zone.</p> <p>Requests the removal of MUZ-R10A.2 as its intent is achieved by MUZ-R10A.1.</p> <p>The Ministry does not support educational facilities as a discretionary activity where compliance cannot be achieved with the permitted activity standards. Educational facilities should be provided for as a restricted discretionary activity in the Mixed Use Zone as educational facilities are essential pieces of social infrastructure required to support the surrounding residential and commercial activities. Any effects council are concerned about can be well managed through appropriate matters of discretion. The matters of discretion we have proposed have been taken from other chapters in the Plan. However, if council does not support these, the Ministry would appreciate the opportunity to work with council to come to an agreement on these matters of discretion.</p> <p>The Ministry also request the title be changed to 'educational facilities' to be consistent with the rest of the Plan and use a term that is defined in the definitions chapter.</p>	<p>Seeks to amend the title to read educational facilities rather than education facilities.</p> <p>Seeks to amend as follows to provide for educational facilities:</p> <p>MUZ-R10A Educational facility</p> <p>Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The educational facility does not cater for more than <del>ten</del> <u>50</u> students, and</li> <li><del>The total number of people accommodated/catered for on the site by activities MUZ R6 – MUZ R10 is no more than ten (excluding staff).</del></li> </ol> <p>MUZ-R10B</p> <p>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: <u>Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>The matters of discretion are:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale, design, layout, setbacks and screening;</li> <li>Contribution to local community wellbeing;</li> </ol>	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /General	Sam Goddard	238.11	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for retail activities in the Mixed-Use Zone (MUZ) but considers that specific provision should be made for supermarkets in the MUZ.	Include specific provision for supermarkets in the Mixed-Use Zone with the following activity statuses: Supermarkets up to 450m <sup>2</sup> - Permitted Supermarkets between 450m <sup>2</sup> and 3,000m <sup>2</sup> - Restricted Discretionary Supermarkets greater than 3,000m <sup>2</sup> - Discretionary	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S5: Building coverage	Sam Goddard	238.12	Oppose	Submitter recognises the need for new developments to provide a sufficient level of amenity for residential uses within the MUZ, however, opposes the types of activities which are accommodated within the MUZ include commercial and light industrial activities that may require a different format. Considers that there are other mechanisms to address infrastructure (stormwater) demands through the provision of detention and retention for example.	Delete the proposed restrictions on the building coverage, impervious area and landscaped area to provide for greater flexibility in the site layout that would better suit the functional requirements of the submitter	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S6: Impervious area	Sam Goddard	238.13	Oppose	Submitter recognises the need for new developments to provide a sufficient level of amenity for residential uses within the MUZ however opposes as the types of activities which are accommodated within the MUZ include commercial and light industrial activities that may require a different format. Considers that there are other mechanisms to address infrastructure (stormwater) demands through the provision of detention and retention for example.	Delete the proposed restrictions on the building coverage, impervious area and landscaped area to provide for greater flexibility in the site layout that would better suit the functional requirements of the submitter.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S7: Landscaped area	Sam Goddard	238.14	Oppose	Opposes as the types of activities which are accommodated within the MUZ include commercial and light industrial activities that may require a different format while recognising the need for new developments to provide a sufficient level of amenity for residential uses within the MUZ. Considers that there are other mechanisms to address infrastructure (stormwater) demands through the provision of detention and retention for example.	Delete the proposed restrictions on the building coverage, impervious area and landscaped area to provide for greater flexibility in the site layout that would better suit the functional requirements of the submitter.	Open Submission

# MUZ - Mixed Use Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Introduction /	Phil Stickney	263.56	Amend	While generally supported, there is a significant volume of text and explanation which does not assist in terms of understanding the intent of the Zone and the key matters that set the scene for the provisions. The result is an introduction which is unwieldy and does not aid in useability or clarity. While the Retail Strategy notes a 200sqm for commercial activities within the zone, that does not appear to be buttressed by market demand and tenancy requirements. The Submitter seeks an increase to 300sqm in this area. That is considered appropriate for redevelopment potential of larger existing MUZ sites.	Re-draft the provisions to focus on salient matters and amend 200sqm to 300sqm.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Issues /General	Phil Stickney	263.57	Amend	While generally supported, there is a significant volume of text and explanation which does not assist in terms of understanding the intent of the Zone and the key matters that set the scene for the provisions. The result is an introduction which is unwieldy and does not aid in useability or clarity. While the Retail Strategy notes a 200sqm for commercial activities within the zone, that does not appear to be buttressed by market demand and tenancy requirements. The Submitter seeks an increase to 300sqm in this area. That is considered appropriate for redevelopment potential of larger existing MUZ sites.	Re-draft the provisions to focus on salient matters and amend 200sqm to 300sqm.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Objectives /General	Phil Stickney	263.58	Amend	While generally supported, there is a significant volume of text and explanation which does not assist in terms of understanding the issues for the Zone and the key matters that set the scene for the provisions. The result is an introduction which is unwieldy and does not aid in useability or clarity.	Re-draft the provisions to focus on salient matters.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R1: New buildings	Phil Stickney	263.59	Oppose	Amend or delete Rule MUZ-R1A as there appears to be no substantive rationale to the inclusion of an alternate standard of 400sqm for a building on a site vs a minimum of 500 for a retail activity on the site. The building coverage and landscape standards, together with the provision of carparking will regulate the built form on the site.	Delete this rule.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R4: Commercial activity - city centre fringe control area	Phil Stickney	263.60	Oppose	Opposes the 150sqm blanket floor area restriction and the limiting of the number of hospitality outlets in Rule MUZ-R4A (2) is considered to be unduly restrictive. It does not correlate to sites of larger scale of the site, the nature of the balance of development on the site and while seeking to manage the vibrancy of the CBD, it has the effect of restricting choice and economic wellbeing opportunities for the community.	Amend the rule to reflect that larger sites can accommodate a greater range of hospitality activities and amend the 150sqm restriction to 250sqm.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R9: Visitor accommodation	Phil Stickney	263.61	Oppose	Amend Rule MUZ-R9 as it significantly limits and places restrictions on visitor accommodation as a Permitted Activity and also defaults any infringing activities to a Discretionary Activity status. This is considered unduly restrictive given the locations of the MUZ and their role in supporting the vibrancy of the CBD by enabling accommodation facilities to establish in bespoke designed buildings within the MUZ. Tourism and accommodation is a key driver of the regional economy, and it is considered that the proposed restrictions are not enabling of these activities in their current form.	Amend the provision to provide for larger scale visitor accommodation as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S8: Open space	Phil Stickney	263.62	Amend	Amend Rule MUZ-S8 as there appear to be editing errors in the standards relating to ground floor outdoor living space requirements. The standards in MUZ-S8 include requirements for roof terraces, balconies but which are captured by the ground floor residential unit requirements. MUZ-S8(3) and (4) is unduly restrictive in respect of setbacks for southern facing yards and will restrict the efficient development of sites within the MUZ.	Amend provision to reflect ground floor standards only. Delete the provisions of MUZ-S8 (3 and 4).	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S10: Minimum residential unit size	Phil Stickney	263.63	Amend	Amend Rule MUZ-S10 in relation to minimum floor areas for units, as with good design it is possible to provide an appropriate living environment that varies from the standards set out.	Amend the minimum floor area standards to: Studio: 35sqm 2- bed: 45 sqm 3- bed: 60 sqm 4- bed: 80 sqm	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Assessment criteria /General	Phil Stickney	263.64	Amend	Amend Assessment Criteria to refine and tighten the consideration of activities and reflect the amendments and changes sought in this submission. In particular, it is not considered reasonably necessary for a Permitted Activity which infringes a standard in The Plan, to fall to automatically being assessed again against the relevant Objectives and Policies of The Plan as part of a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Amend Assessment Criteria and remove the requirement for a restricted discretionary activity to be assessed against the relevant Objectives and Policies of the Plan.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Objectives /MUZ-O6: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Nichola Nicholson	264.1	Support	Supports in principle the efficient provision of infrastructure in order to promote public, active, and multimodal forms of transport as a method to support wellbeing and improved environmental outcomes.	No relief sought. Retain objective as notified (Inferred).	Open Submission



# MUZ - Mixed Use Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Issues /MUZ-I4: Access and connectivity	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.138	Support	Supports I4 as it recognizes the need to integrate land use and transportation planning and the potential for potential traffic conflict. Supports enhancing connectivity for active and public transport, and consideration of function of the transport network.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Objectives /MUZ-O5: Access and connectivity	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.139	Support	Supports O5 as it recognizes the need to integrate land use and transportation planning and the potential for potential traffic conflict. Supports enhancing connectivity for active and public transport, and consideration of function of the transport network.	No specific relief sought	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Policies /MUZ-P4: Access and connectivity	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.140	Support	Supports P4 as it recognizes the need to integrate land use and transportation planning and the potential for potential traffic conflict. We support enhancing connectivity for active and public transport, and consideration of function of the transport network.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.68	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency requires the ability to construct and operate emergency service facilities (i.e., fire stations) in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies. This means new fire stations may be necessary in any zone across the district in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the effects of a fire station can be largely anticipated and, in the most part, do not differ to the effects of many activities that may be anticipated through rural and urban environments.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency requests that emergency service facilities are provided for as permitted activities in the larger, more extensive zones of the district to recognise the critical importance of emergency services to communities. In providing for emergency service facility as a permitted activity would mean that emergency service facilities would be controlled by the subsequent performance standards of each zone (such as height, height in relation to boundary, front yards, building coverage requirements).and the other relevant performance standards in other chapters (i.e., transport) to ensure that any effects are appropriately managed.</p>	<p>Seeks to include new permitted activity as follows:</p> <p><u>xxx-Rx: Emergency service facilities</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status: Permitted</u></p> <p><u>N/A</u></p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.</p>	Open Submission

# MUZ - Mixed Use Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.87	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency's main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</p> <p>SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.</p> <p>In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure and that new connections under the water supply</p>	<p>Seeks to include a new performance standard as follows:</p> <p><u>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</u></p> <p>1. <u>All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u></p> <p>2. <u>Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p><u>Matter of discretion:</u></p> <p>1. <u>The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to</p>	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Policies /MUZ-P5: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Alec Duncan	288.134	Support	<p>Supports this policy to the extent that it seeks to ensure sufficient infrastructure provision and/or mitigation measures to meet demand, including consideration of the effects of climate change.</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

# TCZ - Town Centre Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /TCZ - Town Centre Zone - Standards Table /TCZ-S9: Fences and walls	Susan Dallas	25.31	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /TCZ - Town Centre Zone - Standards Table /TCZ-S9: Fences and walls	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.15	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /Rules /TCZ-R2: Residential activities	Andrea Millar	105.18	Support	Supports the permitted activity rules applying to “residential units” and “residential activity” in the zone as appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided by Ara Poutama.	Retain the permitted activity rule TCZ-R2 applying to “residential activities” in the Town Centre Zone.	Open Submission
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /Rules /General	Andrea Millar	105.20	Oppose	Opposes the activity rules applying to community corrections activity” in the Town Centre Zone as they do not enable community corrections activities, and provides non-complying activity status for these activities in the zone under TCZ-R13. Considers the importance of Community corrections activities and the need to enable non-custodial community corrections sites including within Town Centre Zone which is easily accessible to offenders, and is a zone within which commercial, community and other similar activities are enabled as of right.	Amend to insert a new permitted activity rule for “community corrections activities” in the Town Centre Zone, as follows:  <u>TCZ-RX: Community corrections activities</u> <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u> <u>NA</u>	Open Submission
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /Objectives /TCZ-O1: Quality town centre	Lizzie Reinecke Kim Shannon	176.1	Amend	Considers that the Taradale Commercial Zone (inferred Town Centre Zone) should be expanded to include the properties identified in the full submission, including EIT, Church Road Winery, Mission Estate Winery, 207 and 209 Gloucester Street, 28 Lee Road, 12 Lee Road, 366 and 368 Gloucester Street, 393 Gloucester Street, 20 and 24 Puketapu Road. The reasons given include that it is a natural fit when considering the existing extent of the zone map; the local business community will be expanded and supported and the TBA levied income could be increased.  Seeks to add a new permanent interactive character feature to the Taradale CBD-area. The reasons given include improved vibrancy and amenity, provision of visual interest and attract new customers, and increase pedestrian flow.  Seeks to install a permanent e-bike charging station to the Taradale CBD-area. The reasons given include that Taradale is part of the HB Trails network and is well located as a destination. The Taradale town centre services a large number of aged villages and being able to charge scooters may encourage people to stay longer at the shops.  Seeks to fund one new annual event in Taradale. The reasons given include that Taradale is not included in many of Napier's large events and a new events will provide an injection to businesses at a quiet time of the year.	Rezone (inferred) the following properties to Town Centre Zone:  EIT Church Road Winery Mission Estate Winery 207, 207, 366, 368 and 393 Gloucester Street 12 and 28 Lee Road 20 and 24 Puketapu Road	Open Submission
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /Rules /TCZ-R7: Car parking areas	Holly Jenkins	214.5	Amend	Support standards to manage the attractiveness and interface of at grade car parking areas in commercial zones. Considers the standards fail to recognise practicalities of supermarkets and other commercial activities and that standards require a large portion of a site to be occupied for this purpose. Considers an either/or approach appropriate to achieve landscaping outcomes	Seek that the landscaping requirement of NCZ-R7; LCZ-R10; LFRZ-R3; TCZ-R7; CCZ-R6 be an either/or:  1. Where the car parking area is at-grade: a. a 2 m wide landscaping strip comprised of indigenous plants is provided along the full frontage of the road (except for the vehicle crossing), <del>and</del> <u>or</u> b. one indigenous specimen tree is provided for every ten car parks.	Open Submission
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /TCZ - Town Centre Zone - Standards Table /TCZ-S5: Frontages	Holly Jenkins	214.9	Amend	Considers the need for supermarkets and other commercial activities to locate back from the street for part of a site's frontage to enable vehicle access, manoeuvring and car parking in front of the store. Considers it impractical to be completely built to the street and taking pedestrian access directly from the street and for a large portion of the building to be glazed due to heat transfer over fresh produce.	Amend the standard to provide an alternative landscaping requirement along an Activated Street where it is not possible for a building to adjoin the entire length of the frontage, or provide direct pedestrian access. Amend the standard to recognise the functional and operational requirements of a supermarkets which cannot support large areas of glazing.	Open Submission

# TCZ - Town Centre Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /Rules /TCZ-R11: Service stations	Georgina McPherson	215.142	Oppose	<p>Rule TCZ-R11 is considered to be unduly restrictive with respect to existing service stations. Commercial activities (including retail activities) are permitted in the zone (TCZ-R1). However, service stations are specifically identified in the zone as a discretionary activity (TCZ-R11). The Fuel Companies are concerned that alterations or additions to service stations would also be treated as a discretionary activity, despite there being a permitted activity rule for such activities (TCZ-R9).</p> <p>It is proposed that matter be addressed by adding a condition to rule TCZ-R11 that exempts alterations or additions undertaken in accordance with TCZ-R9.</p>	<p>Amend rule TCZ-R11 as follows:</p> <p>TCZ-R11 Service stations Activity Status: Discretionary</p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p>1. The activity is not provided for under <u>Rule TCZ-R9</u>.</p>	Open Submission
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /TCZ - Town Centre Zone - Standards Table /General	Georgina McPherson	215.143	Support	The Fuel Companies generally support the intent of the TCZ standards and seek that they are retained.	Retain the TCZ standards.	Open Submission
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /Rules /TCZ-R12: Drive-through facilities	Anitha Premraj Sam Goddard	216.10	Amend	Supports the inclusion of drive through facilities in the Town Centre Zone (TCZ). Considers the activity is consistent with Zone objectives and that drive through restaurants should be provided for as a restricted discretionary activity.	Seeks specific provision for drive through restaurants of any size within the Town Centre Zone as a restricted discretionary activity.	Open Submission
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /Objectives /TCZ-O1: Quality town centre	Shravan Miryala	217.28	Support	Supports TCZ objectives in principle	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /Objectives /TCZ-O4: Access and Connectivity	Shravan Miryala	217.29	Support	Supports TCZ objectives in principle	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /Objectives /TCZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Shravan Miryala	217.30	Support	Supports TCZ objectives in principle	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /Policies /TCZ-P3: Town centre living	Shravan Miryala	217.31	Amend	Considers that the amenity of more sensitive activities, such as residential activities, will be better protected where they have been appropriately designed to manage reverse sensitivity effects where there is an interface with lawfully established non-residential activities. Seeks relief consistent with design principle 1: The Site of the National medium density design guide (Ministry for the Environment, May 2022) which seeks that current or proposed nearby non-residential activities are identified and that residential development responds to them.	<p>Amend TCZ-P3 as follows:</p> <p>Enable residential development including conversions of an existing building in the Taradale town centre while:</p> <p>a. managing development to achieve a reasonable standard of amenity for residents, and</p> <p>b. discouraging residential units at ground floor along the street frontage of town centre, <u>and</u></p> <p><u>c. managing reverse sensitivity at zone interfaces and the interface between existing non-residential and noise- sensitive activities.</u></p>	Open Submission
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /Rules /TCZ-R9: Additions and alterations	Shravan Miryala	217.32	Amend	Opposes this rule in part. Considers that clause (1) seeks to control maintenance and repair of buildings' facades in the zone, where repair is defined in Part 1 of the PDP. Submitter disputes how this activity even needs to be controlled in this zone. Considers that in an historic heritage area / building, this activity would be welcomed, however, repair and maintenance of other lawfully established existing buildings would not normally meet the regular definition of alterations, and such an activity is certainly not an addition. Clause (2) permits external alterations (assumed to encompass additions as well) which are less than 25m <sup>2</sup> to which submitter is not opposed.	<p>Amend Rule TCZ-R9 as follows:</p> <p>TCZ-R9: <u>Maintenance, repair, a</u>Additions and alterations</p> <p>RCZ-R9A</p> <p>Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where the following activity conditions are met:</p> <p><del>The activity is maintenance and repair of the building facade; or</del></p> <p><del>(2)</del>(1) External alterations are less than 25 m<sup>2</sup>.</p>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /Rules /TCZ-R11: Service stations	Shravan Miryala	217.33	Oppose	<p>Opposes rule and notes that proposed Rule TCZ-R11 provides that all service stations are a discretionary activity and does not have any qualifying standards nor exceptions. Considers that new or replacement service stations are appropriate to control in this manner, however, without clarification, comment or exceptions, the rule will or could apply to small scale, even trivial, activities, which will have unintended consequences for the resource consenting process. Considers that the following activities should not be applicable under proposed Rule TCZ-R11 at existing service stations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Replacement infrastructure;</li> <li>- Upgrading of underground or above ground infrastructure;</li> <li>- Small scale building or operational changes that do not increase the intensity or scale of the activity (e.g.: traffic);</li> <li>- Maintenance or fixing of anything at the site.</li> <li>- Replacement tanks.</li> </ul> <p>Seeks to clarify that Rule TCZ-R9 would be applicable. Considers that this approach needs to be made clear in the chapter; for example, an advice note under the DA rule. Considers that these types of activities should not require a consent under this rule is because they are upgrades, maintenance, replacements and changes required to ensure efficient operation of lawfully established activities which manage hazardous substances. Considers that It is not in council's or the submitter's interests to prohibit these facilities which use and store hazardous substances and which have bespoke and carefully</p>	<p>Amend Rule TCZ-R11 as follows:</p> <p>TCZ-R11: New or replacement sService stations</p> <p><u>Note: This rule is only relevant for existing service stations if Rule TCZ-R9 is NOT met.</u></p>	Open Submission
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /TCZ - Town Centre Zone - Standards Table /TCZ-S5: Frontages.	Shravan Miryala	217.34	Amend	<p>Notes that Standard TCZ-S5 (other streets) requirements mean that any changes to existing service stations will have to consider this standard which may not strictly be achieved at the existing site identified above in the TCZ. Considers it is unlikely to be achievable for a number of functional requirement reasons, including traffic safety.</p> <p>Opposes the imposition of this standard to existing service stations sites. Acknowledges that landscaping along the road boundary can enhance the attractiveness of a site and mitigate the effects of the development of the site, however, for service station sites incorporating trees into front boundary landscaping is problematic. Considers that the Council anticipates the planting of trees or plants that will be substantial enough to form a visual screen over time. Service station sites have a significant number of traffic movements into and out of the site per day and, where visibility to the forecourt and to signage is critical to a successful and safe operation, substantial trees or hedging can create a nuisance commercially and in terms of root extent and traffic safety. Considers trees can block the view of signage and the forecourt, block visibility of vehicles entering and exiting, develop root systems that interfere with existing infrastructure and services and be difficult to achieve at service stations due to vehicle crossing requirements, storage of underground petroleum products, tanker (fuel delivery) tracking and signage visibility.</p>	<p>Amend Standard TCZ-S5 to exclude existing service station sites from the landscaping requirements. This could be achieved by including the following additional exemption to the standard:</p> <p>1.Where a building is not located along the street frontage, a landscape buffer of 2 m in depth must be provided. This excludes access points. The landscaping must comprise a mix of indigenous trees, shrubs or ground cover plants (including grass).</p> <p><u>Except where:</u></p> <p><u>a. the site is utilised by a lawfully established existing service station activity.</u></p>	Open Submission

# TCZ - Town Centre Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /TCZ - Town Centre Zone - Standards Table /TCZ-S8: Screening	Shravan Miryala	217.35	Oppose	Acknowledges the intent of the standard but has identified that 10m <sup>2</sup> of storage may not be required for all activities, particularly on smaller sites and that, without clarification, the standard may or is likely to apply to small scale additions or alterations to existing activities which may already have suitable storage for their activities and uses. Considers that there is little to no benefit to any person or the environment to get a resource consent under this standard alone for this type of scenario. Considers that the wording of the rule applies to a "site" (as defined in the PDP) as opposed to an "activity". Notes that there could be multiple mixed uses on a single Record of Title (which is a "site") which may require more than 10m <sup>2</sup> . Submitter disputes whether this Standard is the most effective way to achieve its purpose. Considers that Rule TCZ-R8 along with Rule TCZ-R9 will provide an opportunity to consider any minimum storages and screening associated with any new activities.	Delete TCZ-S8	Open Submission
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /Rules /	Sean Thompson	225.12	Amend	<p>Considers that it is not self-evident from the analysis and rationale in the proposed plan, including in terms of s 32 RMA, why relocated buildings should be classified as non-complying in the NCZ, LCZ, LFRZ, LIZ and GIZ. It is accepted that relocated buildings should be discretionary in the Natural Open Space Zone, and there may be urban design and other considerations applicable to the Town Centre Zone and City Centre Zone which warrant different treatment.</p> <p>Since a 2004 Central Otago Environment Court decision most local authorities in New Zealand have either adopted permitted activity classification for relocated buildings (with no standards) or provided for permitted activity status with prescribed performance standards.</p>	<p>Seeks to amend the TCZ Rules as follows:</p> <p>a. Provide for relocated buildings as a permitted activity in all relevant zones, excepting where a specified heritage or conservation or urban design consideration applies;</p> <p>b. For the relocated building rules in all zones, the removal of the requirement to deposit a monitoring fee at the same time as submitting the relocated building report;</p> <p>c. Amending the performance standards in relation to relocated buildings in accordance with the wording in the attached Schedule 1 (which can be found in the attached submission), to provide for:</p> <p>i. modification of the performance timeframes such that relocation on permanent foundation is required within two months, and twelve months is allowed for the completion of all reinstatement works;</p> <p>ii. provision for a pre-inspection report in the same or similar form as found in Schedule 2 (which can be found in the attached submission).</p> <p>Consequential or further relief including to the relevant objectives, policies and provisions of the proposed plan in order to give effect to relief sought.</p> <p>(The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)</p>	Open Submission
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /Objectives /TCZ-O1: Quality town centre	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.83	Amend	Amend TCZ-O1 so that educational facilities are included. As any zone that enables residential activities in or around it should provide for schools and day care centres as essential social infrastructure required to support the surrounding residential and commercial catchment.	<p>Seeks to amend TCZ-O1 so that educational facilities are included as follows:</p> <p>Quality town centre</p> <p>Taradale town centre has a range of commercial, community, recreational, <del>and</del> residential activities <u>and educational facilities</u> that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs.</p>	Open Submission
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /Objectives /TCZ-O4: Access and Connectivity	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.84	Support	Supports this objective to encourage the establishment of multi-modal infrastructure and public transport. The Ministry supports the uptake of students choosing active modes of travel to schools it has health benefits and reduces traffic congestion on the road network at peak pick up and drop off time.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /Policies /TCZ-P1: Vibrant town centre	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.85	Support	Supports TCZ-P1 as it provides the establishment of a wide range and diverse mix of compatible activities. If the Ministry's submission point on TCZ-O1 above is accepted in the correlating objective to TCZ-P1, it will be clear that educational facilities would be considered a compatible activity for this zone and be provided for under this policy.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission

# TCZ - Town Centre Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /Rules /TCZ-R4: Educational activities	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.86	Amend	Amend TCZ-R4, Requests that activity status is corrected to 'educational facility' as this is a term defined in the plan. States that TCZ-R4 is unclear as it does not outline what the activity would be if the educational facility could not comply with the permitted developments standards. Some matters of discretion are listed next to each development standard but nowhere in the chapter does it clearly outline that educational facilities would become a restricted discretionary activity if they cannot comply with the standards. The Ministry proposes that a restricted discretionary status is applied to the activity status box for each educational facility. The Ministry also requests that educational facilities have their own matters of discretion, as often schools cannot comply with the development standards and matters of discretion should be restricted to the relevant effects.	Seeks to Amend the following: Educational activities facility Activity Status: Permitted <u>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: Restricted Discretionary The matters of discretion are:</u> 1. <u>Scale, design, layout, setbacks and screening;</u> 2. <u>Contribution to local community wellbeing;</u> <u>Effects on the streetscape and neighbourhood character;</u>	Open Submission
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /Rules /General	Sam Goddard	238.15	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for commercial activities in the Town Centre Zone (TCZ) however, considers that explicit provision should be made for supermarkets of any size within the TCZ. Notes the zone description and purpose and considers that supermarkets meet the purpose and intent of the TCZ. However, this has not been appropriately reflected in the rules of this zone by specifically providing for supermarkets as a permitted activity. Due to the format of supermarkets, it is considered that a 1,000m <sup>2</sup> GFA restriction is not appropriate in this case.	Amend to provide for supermarkets of any size within the Town Centre Zone as a permitted activity.	Open Submission
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /Rules /TCZ-R7: Car parking areas	Sam Goddard	238.16	Oppose	Opposes TCZ-S5 which requires the provision of one indigenous specimen tree per 10 car parking spaces. This requirement is considered to be unnecessarily onerous given the requirement for a landscaping buffer to be provided.	Remove requirement for providing indigenous trees based on car parking spaces. This requirement does not recognise the functional and operational requirements of the submitter with respect to the provision of car parking.	Open Submission
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /Rules /General	Alec Duncan	288.69	Amend	Fire and Emergency requires the ability to construct and operate emergency service facilities (i.e., fire stations) in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies. This means new fire stations may be necessary in any zone across the district in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations.  Fire and Emergency notes that the effects of a fire station can be largely anticipated and, in the most part, do not differ to the effects of many activities that may be anticipated through rural and urban environments.  Fire and Emergency requests that emergency service facilities are provided for as permitted activities in the larger, more extensive zones of the district to recognise the critical importance of emergency services to communities. In providing for emergency service facility as a permitted activity would mean that emergency service facilities would be controlled by the subsequent performance standards of each zone (such as height, height in relation to boundary, front yards, building coverage requirements).and the other relevant performance standards in other chapters (i.e., transport) to ensure that any effects are appropriately managed.	Seeks to include new permitted activity as follows: <u>xxx-Rx: Emergency service facilities</u>  <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u>  <u>N/A</u>  Or To similar effect.  And any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.[List]	Open Submission

# TCZ - Town Centre Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /TCZ - Town Centre Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.88	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency's main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</p> <p>SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.</p> <p>In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure and that new connections under the water supply</p>	<p>Seeks to include a new performance standard as follows:</p> <p><u>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</u></p> <p>1. <u>All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u></p> <p>2. <u>Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p><u>Matter of discretion:</u></p> <p>1. <u>The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to</p>	Open Submission
TCZ - Town Centre Zone /Policies /TCZ-P5: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Alec Duncan	288.135	Support	<p>Supports this policy to the extent that it seeks to ensure sufficient infrastructure provision and/or mitigation measures to meet demand, including consideration of the effects of climate change.</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission



# CCZ - City Centre Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
CCZ - City Centre Zone /General /General	Chris Morris	61.1	Oppose	The submitter refers to any plans to make certain streets in the CHB pedestrian only, as this can make it difficult and inefficient for courier vans to deliver product to shops in the area and for customers to collect bulky or heavy items from shops by vehicle - impacting store owners, courier companies and the elderly.	Seeks that vehicle access continue to be provided to shops in the CBD for those who need it.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
CCZ - City Centre Zone /Policies /CCZ-P4: City living	Tracey Reyburn	64.3	Support	Supports CCZ-P4: City living provisions in the city centre providing for residential activities with retail activities on the ground floor. Considers that a CCZ (City Centre Zone) should take account of the Art Deco architectural style for new buildings and the zone should incorporate the Marewa Shops area.	Retain CCZ-P4: City living provisions. Seeks that the CCZ (City Centre Zone) provisions for new buildings recognise Art Deco architectural style heritage qualities and the zone is extended to Marewa Shops properties.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
CCZ - City Centre Zone /CCZ - City Centre Zone - Rules /CCZ-R2: Residential activities	Andrea Millar	105.21	Support	Supports the permitted activity rules applying to “residential units” and “residential activity” in the City Centre Zone as appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided by Ara Poutama.	1. Retain the permitted activity rule CCZ-R2 applying to “residential activities” in the City Centre Zone.	Open Submission
CCZ - City Centre Zone /CCZ - City Centre Zone - Rules /General	Andrea Millar	105.22	Oppose	Zone rules do not enable community corrections activities, and provides non-complying activity status for these activities in the zone under LIZ-R7. Considers the importance of enabling non-custodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas, including the City Centre Zone which provides appropriate locations within which to establish community corrections sites, is easily accessible to offenders, and commercial, community and other similar activities are enabled as of right.	1. Insert a new permitted activity rule for “community corrections activities” in the City Centre Zone, as follows:  <u>CCZ-RX: Community corrections activities</u> <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u>	Open Submission
CCZ - City Centre Zone /CCZ - City Centre Zone - Rules /CCZ-R6: Car parking areas	Holly Jenkins	214.6	Amend	Support standards to manage the attractiveness and interface of at grade car parking areas in commercial zones. Considers the standards fail to recognise practicalities of supermarkets and other commercial activities and that standards require a large portion of a site to be occupied for this purpose. Considers an either/or approach appropriate to achieve landscaping outcomes	Seek that the landscaping requirement of NCZ-R7; LCZ-R10; LFRZ-R3; TCZ-R7; CCZ-R6 be an either/or:  1. Where the car parking area is at-grade: a. a 2 m wide landscaping strip comprised of indigenous plants is provided along the full frontage of the road (except for the vehicle crossing), <del>and</del> <u>or</u> b. one indigenous specimen tree is provided for every ten car parks.	Open Submission
CCZ - City Centre Zone /CCZ - City Centre Zone - Standards Table /CCZ-S4: Frontages	Holly Jenkins	214.10	Amend	Considers the need for supermarkets and other commercial activities to locate back from the street for part of a site’s frontage to enable vehicle access, manoeuvring and car parking in front of the store. Considers it impractical to be completely built to the street and taking pedestrian access directly from the street and for a large portion of the building to be glazed due to heat transfer over fresh produce.	Amend the standard to provide an alternative landscaping requirement along an Activated Street where it is not possible for a building to adjoin the entire length of the frontage, or provide direct pedestrian access. Amend the standard to recognise the functional and operational requirements of a supermarkets which cannot support large areas of glazing.	Open Submission
CCZ - City Centre Zone /CCZ - City Centre Zone - Rules /CC-R11: Drive-through facilities	Anitha Premraj Sam Goddard	216.11	Amend	Supports the inclusion of drive through facilities in the City Centre Zone (CCZ). Considers the activity is consistent with Zone objectives and that drive through restaurants should be provided for as a restricted discretionary activity.	Seeks specific provision for drive through restaurants as a restricted discretionary activity within the City Centre zone	Open Submission
CCZ - City Centre Zone /CCZ - City Centre Zone - Rules /	Sean Thompson	225.13	Amend	The submitter considers that it is not self-evident from the analysis and rationale in the proposed plan, including in terms of s 32 RMA, why relocated buildings should be classified as non-complying in the NCZ, LCZ, LFRZ, LIZ and GIZ. It is accepted that relocated buildings should be discretionary in the Natural Open Space Zone, and there may be urban design and other considerations applicable to the Town Centre Zone and City Centre Zone which warrant different treatment.  Since a 2004 Central Otago Environment Court decision most local authorities in New Zealand have either adopted permitted activity classification for relocated buildings (with no standards) or provided for permitted activity status with prescribed performance standards.	Seeks to amend the CCZ Rules as follows: a. Provide for relocated buildings as a permitted activity in all relevant zones, excepting where a specified heritage or conservation or urban design consideration applies; b. For the relocated building rules in all zones, the removal of the requirement to deposit a monitoring fee at the same time as submitting the relocated building report; c. Amending the performance standards in relation to relocated buildings in accordance with the wording in the attached Schedule 1 (which can be found in the attached submission), to provide for: i. modification of the performance timeframes such that relocation on permanent foundation is required within two months, and twelve months is allowed for the completion of all reinstatement works; ii. provision for a pre-inspection report in the same or similar form as found in Schedule 2 (which can be found in the attached submission).Consequential or further relief including to the relevant objectives, policies and provisions of the proposed plan in order to give effect to relief sought.(The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)	Open Submission

# CCZ - City Centre Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
CCZ - City Centre Zone /Objectives /CCZ-O1: Quality city centre	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.87	Support	Supports CCZ-O1 as it recognizes the vital role education plays in the city centre.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
CCZ - City Centre Zone /Objectives /CCZ-O3: Access and connectivity	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.88	Support	Supports this objective to encourage the establishment of multi-modal infrastructure and public transport. The Ministry supports the uptake of students choosing active modes of travel to schools, as it has health benefits and reduces traffic congestion on the road network at peak pick up and drop off time.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
CCZ - City Centre Zone /Policies /CCZ-P1: Quality city centre	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.89	Support	Supports CCZ-P1 as it provides the establishment of a wide range of compatible activities. The correlating objective to this policy (CCZ-O1) has already listed education as a key activity within the city centre. Therefore, the Ministry is comfortable that educational facilities would be considered a compatible activity.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
CCZ - City Centre Zone /Policies /CCZ-P5: Access and connectivity	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.90	Support	Supports this objective to encourage the establishment of multi-modal infrastructure and public transport. The Ministry supports the uptake of students choosing active modes of travel to schools, as it has health benefits and reduces traffic congestion on the road network at peak pick up and drop off time.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
CCZ - City Centre Zone /CCZ - City Centre Zone - Rules /CCZ-R4: Educational activities	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.91	Amend	<p>Amend CCZ-R4, considers activity status is corrected to 'educational facility', as this is a term defined under the Proposed Plan. States CCZ-R4 is unclear as it does not outline what the activity status would be if the educational facility could not comply with the permitted developments standards. Some matters of discretion are listed next to each development standard but nowhere in the chapter does it clearly outline that educational facilities would become a restricted discretionary activity if they cannot comply with the standards.</p> <p>The Ministry requested greater clarity is provided. The Ministry propose that a restricted discretionary status is applied to the activity status box for each educational facility. The Ministry also requests that educational facilities have their own matters of discretion, as often schools cannot comply with the development standards and matters of discretion should be restricted to the relevant effects.</p>	<p>Seeks to Amend CCZ-R4 as follows:</p> <p><u>Educational activities facility</u></p> <p>Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p><u>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: Restricted Discretionary</u> The matters of discretion are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Scale, design, layout, setbacks and screening;</u></li> <li><u>Contribution to local community wellbeing;</u></li> </ol> <p><u>Effects on the streetscape and neighbourhood character;</u></p>	Open Submission
CCZ - City Centre Zone /CCZ - City Centre Zone - Rules /General	Sam Goddard	238.17	Amend	<p>Supports the permitted activity status for commercial activities in the City Centre Zone however considers that explicit provision should be made for supermarkets in the CCZ.</p> <p>Notes the purpose of the CCZ and that the very nature of supermarkets is to provide for the day-to-day needs of people and communities. Therefore, it is considered that supermarkets meet the purpose and intent of the CCZ. However, this has not been appropriately reflected in the rules of this zone by specifically providing for supermarkets as a permitted activity.</p>	Amend to provide for supermarkets of any size as a permitted activity within the City Centre zone	Open Submission
CCZ - City Centre Zone /CCZ - City Centre Zone - Rules /CCZ-R6: Car parking areas	Sam Goddard	238.18	Oppose	Opposes CCZ-R6 which requires the provision of one indigenous specimen tree per 10 car parking spaces. This requirement is considered to be unnecessarily onerous given the requirement for a landscaping buffer to be provided.	Remove requirement for providing indigenous trees based on car parking spaces. This requirement does not recognise the functional and operational requirements of the submitter with respect to the provision of car parking.	Open Submission
CCZ - City Centre Zone /Policies /CCZ-P3: Quality public realm	Kainga Ora - Brendon Liggett	285.13	Oppose	Opposes the use of the words 'maintain and enhance' within Policy CCZ-P3 and within the purpose statements of the standards table. Seeks these are amended to refer to the 'planned built environment' in line with Policy 6 of the NPS-UD. The consequential requirement for development to 'maintain and enhance' the existing character of an area conflicts with the overall direction of the PDP to enable growth and intensification	Amend to refer to the 'planned built environment' in line with Policy 6 of the NPS-UD.	Open Submission
CCZ - City Centre Zone /CCZ - City Centre Zone - Standards Table /CCZ-S2: Building setback at upper floors	Kainga Ora - Brendon Liggett	285.14	Amend	Supports standard CCZ-S2 as a way of enabling greater heights whilst also managing potential adverse effects on the receiving environment. However, seeks that a diagram be inserted within this standard to clearly illustrate the application as this would be beneficial for plan users.	Seeks that a diagram be inserted within this standard to clearly illustrate the application.	Open Submission

# CCZ - City Centre Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
CCZ - City Centre Zone /Assessment criteria /CCZ-AC3: New buildings (CCZ-R7)	Kainga Ora - Brendon Liggett	285.15	Amend	Supports engagement with and the involvement of mana whenua on developments, impacting on a site of significance and associated cultural values, however considers that the inclusion of 'mana whenua values to inform the design of the building' as assessment criteria within CCZ-AC3 for any new building within the City Centre would imply that a Cultural Values Assessment or Cultural Impact Assessment for all proposals for new buildings within this zone would be required. Seeks clarification as to whether this was the intention of the assessment criteria and seeks changes to the criteria to clarify its intended purpose.	Seeks clarification as to whether this was the intention of the assessment criteria and seeks changes to the criteria to clarify its intended purpose.	Open Submission
CCZ - City Centre Zone /CCZ - City Centre Zone - Rules /General	Alec Duncan	288.70	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency requires the ability to construct and operate emergency service facilities (i.e., fire stations) in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies. This means new fire stations may be necessary in any zone across the district in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the effects of a fire station can be largely anticipated and, in the most part, do not differ to the effects of many activities that may be anticipated through rural and urban environments.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency requests that emergency service facilities are provided for as permitted activities in the larger, more extensive zones of the district to recognise the critical importance of emergency services to communities. In providing for emergency service facility as a permitted activity would mean that emergency service facilities would be controlled by the subsequent performance standards of each zone (such as height, height in relation to boundary, front yards, building coverage requirements), and the other relevant performance standards in other chapters (i.e., transport) to ensure that any effects are appropriately managed.</p>	<p>Seeks to include new permitted activity as follows:</p> <p><u>xxx-Rx: Emergency service facilities</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status: Permitted</u></p> <p><u>N/A</u></p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.</p>	Open Submission
CCZ - City Centre Zone /CCZ - City Centre Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.89	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency's main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</p> <p>SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB-S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.</p> <p>In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure and that new connections under the water supply</p>	<p>Seeks to include a new performance standard as follows:</p> <p><u>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</u></p> <p><u>1. All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u></p> <p><u>2. Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p><u>Matter of discretion:</u></p> <p><u>1. The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to</p>	Open Submission

## CCZ - City Centre Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
CCZ - City Centre Zone /Policies /CCZ-P7: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Alec Duncan	288.136	Support	Supports this policy to the extent that it seeks to ensure sufficient infrastructure provision and/or mitigation measures to meet demand, including consideration of the effects of climate change.	Retain as notified.	<a href="#">Open Submission</a>

# PREC8 - Foreshore Commercial Precinct

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PREC8 - Foreshore Commercial Precinct /PREC8 - Foreshore Commercial Precinct - Standards Table	Susan Dallas	25.16	Amend	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
PREC8 - Foreshore Commercial Precinct /PREC8 - Foreshore Commercial Precinct - Standards Table	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.16	Amend	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned..	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission

# PREC9 - Napier City Heritage Precinct

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PREC9 - Napier City Heritage Precinct /PREC9 - Napier City Heritage Precinct - Standards Table / PREC9-S1: Standards of the underlying zone	Susan Dallas	25.18	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.(Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
PREC9 - Napier City Heritage Precinct /PREC9 - Napier City Heritage Precinct - Standards Table / PREC9-S1: Standards of the underlying zone	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.18	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
PREC9 - Napier City Heritage Precinct /Objectives /PREC9-O1: Napier City Heritage Precinct heritage values and character	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.170	Support	Supports Objective PREC9-O1: Napier City Heritage Precinct heritage values and character as the proposed objective is appropriate for a defined heritage area.	Retain Objective PREC9-O1: Napier City Heritage Precinct heritage values and character as notified.	Open Submission
PREC9 - Napier City Heritage Precinct /Policies /PREC9-P1: New buildings and alterations/additions	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.171	Support	Supports Policy PREC9-P1: New buildings and alterations / additions as the proposed policy is appropriate for a defined heritage area.	Retain Policy PREC9-P1: New buildings and alterations / additions as notified.	Open Submission
PREC9 - Napier City Heritage Precinct /Policies /PREC9-P2: Removal or demolition of buildings	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.172	Support	Supports Policy PREC9-P2: Removal or demolition of buildings as enabling the demolition of non-contributing (non-scheduled) buildings within the Napier Heritage Precinct.	Retain Policy PREC9-P2: Removal or demolition of buildings as notified.	Open Submission
PREC9 - Napier City Heritage Precinct /PREC9 - Napier City Heritage Precinct - Rules Table /PREC9-R3: Demolition or relocation off site of a building	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.173	Support	Supports Rule PREC9-R3: Demolition or relocation off site of a building as HNZPT supports the Controlled Activity status for non-scheduled buildings within the Precinct.	Retain Rule PREC9-R3: Demolition or relocation off site of a building as notified.	Open Submission
PREC9 - Napier City Heritage Precinct /PREC9 - Napier City Heritage Precinct - Rules Table /PREC9-R5: New buildings	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.174	Support	Supports Rule PREC9-R5: New buildings as an activity status of Restricted Discretionary for new buildings in the heritage Precinct is supported.	Retain Rule PREC9-R5: New buildings as notified.	Open Submission
PREC9 - Napier City Heritage Precinct /Assessment criteria /PREC9-AC1: Additions and alterations (PREC9-R1 and PREC-R2); New buildings (PREC9-R5)General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.175	Support	Supports PREC9-AC1: Additions and alterations (PREC9-R1 and PREC-R2); New buildings (PREC9-R5) with HNZPT supporting the assessment criteria for the Precinct.	Retain Assessment criteria PREC9-AC1: Additions and alterations (PREC9-R1 and PREC-R2); New buildings (PREC9-R5) as notified.	Open Submission

# PREC10 - West Quay Waterfront Precinct

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PREC10 - West Quay Waterfront Precinct /PREC10 - West Quay Waterfront Precinct - Standards Table	Susan Dallas	25.19	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
PREC10 - West Quay Waterfront Precinct /PREC10 - West Quay Waterfront Precinct - Standards Table	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.19	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
PREC10 - West Quay Waterfront Precinct /General /General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.176	Support	Supports PREC10 - West Quay Waterfront Precinct Objectives, Policies and Rules for this heritage Precinct. The Provisions are largely consistent with those used for the Overlay areas.	Retain PREC10 - West Quay Waterfront Precinct Objectives, Policies and Rules as notified.	Open Submission

# LIZ - Light Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Standards Table	Susan Dallas	25.29	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Standards Table	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.27	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Rules Table /General	Andrea Millar	105.23	Oppose	Opposes the rules in the LIZ. Zone rules do not enable community corrections activities, and provides non-complying activity status for these activities in the zone under LIZ-R7. Considers Industrial areas provide suitable sites for community corrections activities and so provision should be made to enable non-custodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas, including the Light Industrial Zone. Community corrections activities are a compatible and appropriate activity in industrial zones, consistent with the character and amenity, and they are not prone to reverse sensitivity.	Insert a new permitted activity rule for "community corrections activities" in the Light Industrial Zone, as follows:  <b><u>LIZ-Rx: Community corrections activities</u></b> <b><u>Activity status: Permitted</u></b>	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Introduction /	Sera Chambers	150.198	Oppose	opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Light Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Issues	Sera Chambers	150.199	Oppose	opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Light Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Issues	Sera Chambers	150.200	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property / landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Light Industrial Zone (LIZ) may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Issues	Sera Chambers	150.201	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property / landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Light Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Objectives	Sera Chambers	150.202	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property / landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Light Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Objectives	Sera Chambers	150.203	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property / landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Light Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Objectives	Sera Chambers	150.204	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Light Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission



# LIZ - Light Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Policies	Sera Chambers	150.205	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Light Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Policies	Sera Chambers	150.206	Amend	Considers that the policy should be amended to ensure that existing adjoining property / landowners have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Amend the policy to add that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Light Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Policies	Sera Chambers	150.207	Amend	Considers that the policy should be amended to ensure that existing adjoining property / landowners have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Amend the policy to add that the people of Napier City should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Light Industrial Zone (LIZ) may impact upon their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Policies	Sera Chambers	150.208	Oppose	Opposes the Policy on the basis that existing adjoining property / landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Light Industrial Zone (LIZ) may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Standards Table	Sera Chambers	150.209	Oppose	Opposes Standards on the basis that existing adjoining property / landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Light Industrial Zone (LIZ) may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Standards Table	Sera Chambers	150.210	Oppose	opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Light Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Standards Table	Sera Chambers	150.211	Oppose	opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Light Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Standards Table	Sera Chambers	150.212	Oppose	opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Light Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Assessment criteria	Sera Chambers	150.213	Oppose	opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Light Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Assessment criteria	Sera Chambers	150.214	Oppose	opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Light Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission

# LIZ - Light Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Assessment criteria	Sera Chambers	150.215	Oppose	opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Light Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Standards Table	Sheena McGuire	168.121	Amend	Notes that LIZ Chapter does not contain a specific rail corridor building setback standard and there is no yard setback that applies to the corridor. Considers that setbacks are a common planning tool used to ensure the safe and efficient operation of activities such as the railway corridor, particularly when it may come into conflict with adjacent land uses. For rail, a setback provides a safe physical distance between a building and the railway corridor boundary. Heavy freight trains run on the railway lines through the Napier City District. Considers that without a sufficient setback, people painting their buildings, clearing gutters or doing works on their roof will need to access or foul the rail corridor. If a person or object encroaches onto the rail corridor, there is a substantial risk of injury or death for the person entering the rail corridor. A setback control has obvious safety benefits for the users of the land adjoining the rail corridor and users of the rail corridor. Also notes efficiency benefits for rail operations, mitigating against the risk of train services being interrupted by unauthorised persons or objects entering the rail corridor. Considers that without appropriate setback requirements, there is significant risk of adverse health and safety effects impacting people locating and working in proximity to the railway corridor. Seeks a new clause within LIZ-S1 to require a 5m setback for structures and buildings from the rail corridor. Matters of discretion are also sought in the case that the setback cannot be achieved.	Amend as follows: ... 4. <u>Rail corridor setbacks:</u>  <u>No part of any building or structure may be located within a 5m setback from a boundary shared with a rail corridor.</u>  Matters of discretion are: 1. Purpose of the standard; 2. Quality living environments; 3. Amenity values; 4. Character of the area; 5. Operation and maintenance of watercourses and open drains; 6. <u>The safe and efficient operation of the rail network;</u> 7. <u>Compatibility with the surrounding environment; and</u> 8. The reason for the reduced setback.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Rules Table	Cameron Drury	185.2	Amend	Considers that the properties at 41 and 63 Corunna Bay are appropriate for Large Format Retail activities as well as Light Industrial activities (for which they are zoned). This can be achieved by focusing the rule to those office accommodation, retail and commercial activities that are associated with an industrial activity so that individual retail activities can be provided for under a separate rule framework.	Amend the activity description of Rule LIZ-R2 as follows: 'office accommodation, retail and commercial activities <u>associated with an industrial activity</u> '	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Rules Table	Cameron Drury	185.3	Amend	Considers that the properties at 41 and 63 Corunna Bay are appropriate for Large Format Retail activities as well as Light Industrial activities (for which they are zoned). This can be achieved by providing for Large Format Retail on the site as a Permitted Activity in recognition of the area of the site to enable retail activities which require large floor areas and its accessibility.	Amend the rules by introducing a new Permitted Activity Rule pertaining to the site similar to LFRZ-R1(1). This could be achieved either through a new precinct or a new rule in the LIZ specifically applying to the site, or alternative similar relief.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Rules Table	Cameron Drury	185.4	Oppose	Considers that the properties at 41 and 63 Corunna Bay are appropriate for Large Format Retail activities as well as Light Industrial activities (for which they are zoned). This can be achieved by providing for Large Format Retail on the site as a Permitted Activity in recognition of the area of the site to enable retail activities which require large floor areas and its accessibility.		Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Rules Table	Cameron Drury	185.5	Amend	Considers that the properties at 41 and 63 Corunna Bay are appropriate for Large Format Retail activities as well as Light Industrial activities (for which they are zoned). This can be achieved by providing for Large Format Retail on the site as a Permitted Activity in recognition of the area of the site to enable retail activities which require large floor areas and its accessibility.	Amend the PDP to provide subsequent changes to Objectives, and Policies, Standards Table and Assessment Criteria, either through the LIZ and/or new Corunna Bay precinct.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Standards Table	Ryan Andrew Schnell	204.1	Amend	considers that when looking at any of the industrial areas it seems that the building height restrictions do not take into account some of the trends we are seeing in the international market places, who are facing similar issue to those we are experiencing. Due to the lack of available space in industrial areas, multi-level warehousing facilities are becoming more common and while the submitter does not have any current plans for such facilities it is something that they are exploring further.	seeks for the maximum building height limit to be increased to allow for buildings higher than two storey.	Open Submission

# LIZ - Light Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Rules Table /General	Hus Narsai	205.3	Oppose	Acknowledges the need to control the location, nature and scale of activities that interface with residential zones. Considers explicit provision should be made for trade suppliers within the zone as restricted discretionary activity.	Bunnings seeks for specific provision for trade suppliers in the Light Industry Zone with the following activity statuses: Trade suppliers – Restricted Discretionary	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Standards Table	Hus Narsai	205.4	Oppose	Opposes the proposed restrictions on impervious areas as they limit the potential scale of development. Considers there are other mechanisms to control stormwater run-off such as the provision of detention and retention for example.	Remove the proposed restrictions on impervious area to provide for greater flexibility in the site layout that would better suit functional requirements of Bunnings.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Issues	Georgina McPherson	215.144	Support	The Fuel Companies support the management of reverse sensitivity effects and incompatible activities in the LIZ.	Retain LIZ-I1, LIZ-O3, and LIZ-P3 as notified.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Objectives /LIZ-O3: Incompatible activities	Georgina McPherson	215.145	Support	The Fuel Companies support the management of reverse sensitivity effects and incompatible activities in the LIZ.	Retain LIZ-I1, LIZ-O3, and LIZ-P3 as notified.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Policies /LIZ-P3: Incompatible industrial activities	Georgina McPherson	215.146	Support	The Fuel Companies support the management of reverse sensitivity effects and incompatible activities in the LIZ.	Retain LIZ-I1, LIZ-O3, and LIZ-P3 as notified.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Objectives /LIZ-O4: Non-industrial activities	Georgina McPherson	215.147	Amend	The Fuel Companies support the general intent of the objective, which provides for limited non-industrial activities in the LIZ zone, but consider that it does not adequately provide for service stations that are otherwise appropriate and compatible with an industrial zoning. The objective should be amended to recognise that activities such as service stations can appropriately locate within the Light Industry Zone without compromising the purpose, efficiency or functionality of the zone.	Amend LIZ-O4 as follows:  LIZ-O4: Non-industrial activities  Non-industrial activities are not located in the zone unless the activity <u>will not compromise the efficiency or functionality of the zone for light industrial activities is ancillary to the primary industrial use of the land.</u>	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Policies /LIZ-P2: Light industrial activities and adjacent land uses	Georgina McPherson	215.148	Amend	The Fuel Companies support the intent of the policies but are concerned that that it does not recognise that non-industrial activities such as service stations can appropriately locate in the zone.	Amend LIZ-P2 as follows:  LIZ-P2: Light industrial activities and adjacent land uses  The Light Industrial Zone is only used for the ongoing operation and development of light industrial activities, related service activities and ancillary activities and non-industrial activities that are an efficient use of the physical resource of the zone and do not compromise the amenity values of neighbouring residential zones.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Policies /LIZ-P5: Reverse sensitivity	Georgina McPherson	215.150	Amend	Policy LIZ-P5 seeks to manage reverse sensitivity effects only on light industrial activities in the zone. While this is supported, the Fuel Companies consider that the policy should also recognise reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities that are appropriately located in the zone, such as service stations.	Amend LIZ-P5 as follows:  LIZ-P5: Reverse sensitivity  Avoid activities that would give rise to reverse sensitivity effects that may constrain the efficient operation of light industrial activities <u>and other lawfully established activities</u> in the zone.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Rules Table /General	Georgina McPherson	215.151	Oppose	Service stations are defined as commercial and retail activities but are typically unable to comply with the rule conditions. Consequently, a resource consent would be required for alterations or additions at existing service stations or for the development of new service stations. The Fuel Companies consider that this is overly restrictive considering the purpose of the zone and the compatibility of service stations with other activities in the zone. The Fuel Companies seek a new rule that provides for service stations in the zone.	Add a new LIZ rule as follows:  <u>LIZ-RX: Service stations LIZ-RXA</u>  <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u>  <u>LIZ-RXB</u>  <u>Activity status where standards are not met:</u>  <u>Restricted Discretionary</u>  <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>1. The matters of discretion stated for the relevant LIZ standard(s).</u>	Open Submission

# LIZ - Light Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Standards Table	Georgina McPherson	215.152	Oppose	The definition of structure will capture structures such as boundary fences being required to comply with bulk and location standards. This will have (unintended) consequences for a large number of industrial zoned activities, which may require fences for screening or security purposes, and the yard standard will trigger the need to a consent for those activities. In addition, a separate standard LIZ-S5 applies to fences, so fences should be excluded from GIZ-S1. Existing buildings at some service station sites adjoining a residential zone are already less than 3m from the boundary, however this does not cause amenity effects due to the use of landscaping etc. The landscaping requirement is difficult to retrofit to existing activities and consider the use of a fence is more appropriate.	Amend yard standard LIZ-S1 as follows:  3. Other yards:  a. any part of a building or structure ( <u>excluding a fence</u> ) or storage area (including eaves and guttering) must not be erected closer than <u>3</u> m from the boundary of any land not zoned for industrial activities; <u>and</u>  b. a minimum of a 2-metre-wide landscaped area of indigenous plants must be provided parallel to the boundary of any land not zoned for industrial activities. This landscaped area must create a visual screen with a minimum height of at least 1.8 m, and the landscaped area must be maintained to ensure ongoing plant health. <del>and</del> and the <u>landscaped area</u> must be maintained to ensure ongoing plant health., <u>or</u>  <u>c. a close-boarded or similar solid fence or wall of a minimum 1.8 m in height must be provided parallel to the boundary of any land not zoned for industrial activities.</u>	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Standards Table	Georgina McPherson	215.153	Oppose	The Fuel Companies are not opposed in principal to the management of stormwater from sites where there's a risk of hazardous substances or contaminants becoming entrained in stormwater. The Fuel Companies sites are already well managed, including compliance with national-level guidelines. Clause (1) seeks to prevent the discharge of stormwater to the Ahuriri estuary, or any waterbody or open drain. That is, the clause seeks to control stormwater discharges to the environment that are regulated by the Regional Council under the Hawke's Bay Regional Resource Management Plan, and do not properly fall within the territorial authority functions in the RMA. The clause results in inappropriate duplication of function and consenting requirements and is opposed. Fuel Companies consider the existing Hawke's Bay Regional Resource Management Plan provisions already provide an efficient and effective approach to managing stormwater discharges from industrial and trade premises, with no need to duplicate the regulation of discharges from such sites at a district level. Standard LIZ-S4 duplicates the controls provided in the Proposed Plan stormwater (SW) chapter, as well as existing Regional Council controls on discharges from industrial or trade premises. This creates confusion, unnecessary duplication and potentially inconsistent outcomes, and LIZ-S4 should be deleted.	Delete standard LIZ-S4: Stormwater run-off.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Policies /LIZ-P4: Non-industrial and ancillary activities	Georgina McPherson	215.199	Amend	The Fuel Companies support the intent of the policies but are concerned that that it does not recognise that non-industrial activities such as service stations can appropriately locate in the zone.	LIZ-P4: Non-industrial and ancillary activities  Avoid non-industrial activities in the Light Industrial Zone except when the activity is compatible with industrial activities and:  a. supports and is directly related to a permitted or consented industrial activity located on the same site, <u>or</u> b. provides essential services to people employed in businesses located in the zone, <u>or</u> c. <u>does not compromise the efficiency or functionality of the zone for light industrial activities.</u>	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Objectives /LIZ-O3: Incompatible activities	Shravan Miryala	217.50	Support	Supports the management of reverse sensitivity effects in the LIZ.	<b>Retain</b> Objective LIZ-O3 as notified.	Open Submission

# LIZ - Light Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Objectives /LIZ-O4: Non-industrial activities	Shravan Miryala	217.51	Amend	Supports the general intent of the objective, which provides for limited non-industrial activities in the LIZ zone, but considers that it does not adequately provide for service stations that are otherwise appropriate and compatible with an industrial zoning. Considers that the objective should be amended to recognise that activities such as service stations can appropriately locate within the Light Industry Zone without compromising the purpose, efficiency or functionality of the zone.	Amend Objective LIZ-O4 as follows:  LIZ-O4: Non-industrial activities  Non-industrial activities are not located in the zone unless the activity <u>will not compromise the efficiency or functionality of the zone for light industrial activities is ancillary to the primary industrial use of the land.</u>	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Policies /LIZ-P2: Light industrial activities and adjacent land uses	Shravan Miryala	217.52	Amend	Supports the intent of LIZ-P2 but is concerned that that it does not recognise that non-industrial activities such as service stations can appropriately locate in the zone.	Amend LIZ-P2 as follows:  LIZ-P2: Light industrial activities and adjacent land uses The Light Industrial Zone is only used for the ongoing operation and development of light industrial activities, related service activities and ancillary activities <u>and non-industrial activities</u> that are an efficient use of the physical resource of the zone and do not compromise the amenity values of neighbouring residential zones.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Policies /LIZ-P4: Non-industrial and ancillary activities	Shravan Miryala	217.53	Support	Supports the intent of LIZ-P4 but is concerned that that it does not recognise that non-industrial activities such as service stations can appropriately locate in the zone.	Amend LIZ-P4 as follows:  LIZ-P4: Non-industrial and ancillary activities Avoid non-industrial activities in the Light Industrial Zone except when the activity is compatible with industrial activities and:  a. supports and is directly related to a permitted or consented industrial activity located on the same site, or b. provides essential services to people employed in businesses located in the zone, <u>or does not compromise the efficiency or functionality of the zone for light industrial activities.</u>	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Policies /LIZ-P5: Reverse sensitivity	Shravan Miryala	217.54	Amend	Supports LIZ-P5 intent to manage reverse sensitivity effects only on light industrial activities in the zone but considers that the policy should also recognise reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities that are appropriately located in the zone, such as service stations.	Amend LIZ-P5 as follows:  LIZ-P5: Reverse sensitivity  Avoid activities that would give rise to reverse sensitivity effects that may constrain the efficient operation of light industrial activities <u>and other lawfully established activities</u> in the zone.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Rules Table /General	Shravan Miryala	217.55	Amend	Considers that service stations are not anticipated with a specific rule in the LIZ where such activities should be anticipated. Notes that service stations are not industrial activities but they meet the definition of 'commercial activity' and 'retail activity' in the PDP. Permitted activity rule LIZ-R2A provides for retail and commercial activities, but service stations would not comply with the rule conditions. Considers that the need for resource consent for changes or new service stations overly restrictive given their compatibility with other activities in the zone. Seeks a new rule provides for service stations in the zone	Add a new LIZ rule as follows:  <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u>  <u>LIZ-RXB</u>  <u>Activity status where standards are not met:</u>  <u>Restricted Discretionary</u>  <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> 2. <u>The matters of discretion stated for the relevant LIZ standard(s).</u>	Open Submission

# LIZ - Light Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Standards Table	Shravan Miryala	217.56	Oppose	Supports managing stormwater from sites where hazardous substances or contaminants pose a risk, noting Z Energy's existing adherence to Ministry for the Environment guidelines. However, considers that LIZ-S4 clause (1), seeks to regulate stormwater discharges to the environment already under the jurisdiction of the Regional Council. Considers the existing Hawke's Bay Regional Resource Management Plan provisions already provide an efficient and effective approach to managing stormwater discharges from industrial and trade premises, with no need to duplicate the regulation of discharges from such sites at a district level. Acknowledges the intent of standard LIZ-S4(2) regarding interceptor traps, but disputes the requirement for total contaminant removal, suggesting it conflicts with established guidelines such as the MfE Guidelines where 15mg/l of total petroleum hydrocarbons is regarded as a best practice threshold. Petroleum industry activities are undertaken in compliance with the MfE Guidelines and are widely accepted in plans as being best practice. Notes that not all sites in the Light Industrial Zone handle or store hazardous substances, therefore considers that an interceptor trap may not be necessary or may not be the only or most appropriate method of treating / managing stormwater from sites with a Light Industrial Zoning. Considers that setting an impervious area threshold in standard LIZ-S4(3) may be inappropriate, noting that it may be unreasonable for existing fully developed sites to convert paved areas to permeable surfaces. These sites will have existing operational requirements and that paving of surfaces can be an appropriate means of managing the risks associated with HAIL sites and contaminated soils, for which an industrial zone is likely to be the most appropriate location. Considers standard LIZ-S4 duplicates existing controls provided in the Proposed Plan and Regional Council regulations, leading to confusion and inconsistency, and seeks its deletion.	Delete standard LIZ-S4: Stormwater run-off.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Standards Table	Shravan Miryala	217.57	Amend	Notes that LIZ-S6 (outdoor storage) requires any outdoor storage areas are to be screened from the view of any adjacent residential zone or public open space but Outdoor storage is not defined and the standard provides no additional clarification. Seeks amendment or clarity to ensure that the standard does not relate to storage of fuel in above ground tanks.	<p><b>Amend</b> LIZ-S6(2) to exclude above ground storage of fuel at service stations, as follows:</p> <p><u>Any outdoor storage areas are to be screened, except for the display of goods for retail sale, must be fully screened by a solid fence or wall of a minimum height of 2m</u> from the view of any adjacent residential zone or public open space.</p> <p><u>This standard does not apply to aboveground tanks at service stations.</u></p> <p>And/or</p> <p>Clarify through a new definition or note what is intended by 'outdoor storage', including ensuring above ground tanks are not considered 'outdoor storage'.</p>	Open Submission

# LIZ - Light Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Rules Table	Sean Thompson	225.14	Amend	<p>Considers that it is not self-evident from the analysis and rationale in the proposed plan, including in terms of s 32 RMA, why relocated buildings should be classified as non-complying in the NCZ, LCZ, LFRZ, LIZ and GIZ. It is accepted that relocated buildings should be discretionary in the Natural Open Space Zone, and there may be urban design and other considerations applicable to the Town Centre Zone and City Centre Zone which warrant different treatment.</p> <p>Since a 2004 Central Otago Environment Court decision most local authorities in New Zealand have either adopted permitted activity classification for relocated buildings (with no standards) or provided for permitted activity status with prescribed performance standards.</p>	<p>Seeks to amend the LIZ Rules as follows:</p> <p>a. Provide for relocated buildings as a permitted activity in all relevant zones, excepting where a specified heritage or conservation or urban design consideration applies;</p> <p>b. For the relocated building rules in all zones, the removal of the requirement to deposit a monitoring fee at the same time as submitting the relocated building report;</p> <p>c. Amending the performance standards in relation to relocated buildings in accordance with the wording in the attached Schedule 1 (which can be found in the attached submission), to provide for:</p> <p>i. modification of the performance timeframes such that relocation on permanent foundation is required within two months, and twelve months is allowed for the completion of all reinstatement works;</p> <p>ii. provision for a pre-inspection report in the same or similar form as found in Schedule 2 (which can be found in the attached submission).</p> <p>iii. For relocated buildings in the Light Industrial Zone (LIZ) and General Industrial Zone (GIZ), the further amendment of performance standards removing the need for a pre-inspection report and monitoring fee.</p> <p>Consequential or further relief including to the relevant objectives, policies and provisions of the proposed plan in order to give effect to relief sought.</p>	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Policies /LIZ-P4: Non-industrial and ancillary activities	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.92	Support	Supports this policy as it enables nonindustrial activities where they are compatible with the zone, including educational facilities like work skills training centres where people are trained on industrial based skills. These facilities are only compatible with industrial zones and should be provided for within the provisions.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Rules Table /General	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.93	Amend	Seeks to amend LIZ as certain industrial training facilities that can only be located in industrial areas should be allowed. However, agrees that schools and childcare facilities should be a non-complying activity within the industrial zones.	<p>Seeks to amend as follows:</p> <p><b>Educational facilities</b></p> <p><u>Where: It is a training facility that is ancillary to industrial activities Activity Status: Discretionary</u></p>	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Issues /LIZ-I5: Areas of land suitable for accommodating heavy industrial activities are not available within the Light Industrial Zone	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.141	Support	Supports I5 as it recognises industrial activities can place demand on traffic and offsite effects and ensures there is suitable infrastructure to support the land use.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Objectives /LIZ-O5: Low impact industrial activities	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.142	Support	Supports O5 as it provides for industrial activities being located and designed to have low impact on safety and environmental values.		Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Policies /LIZ-P1: Low impact industrial activities	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.143	Support	Supports P1 as it enables industrial activities to be compatible with surrounding land uses	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

# LIZ - Light Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Rules Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.71		<p>Fire and Emergency requires the ability to construct and operate emergency service facilities (i.e., fire stations) in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies. This means new fire stations may be necessary in any zone across the district in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the effects of a fire station can be largely anticipated and, in the most part, do not differ to the effects of many activities that may be anticipated through rural and urban environments.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency requests that emergency service facilities are provided for as permitted activities in the larger, more extensive zones of the district to recognise the critical importance of emergency services to communities. In providing for emergency service facility as a permitted activity would mean that emergency service facilities would be controlled by the subsequent performance standards of each zone (such as height, height in relation to boundary, front yards, building coverage requirements).and the other relevant performance standards in other chapters (i.e., transport) to ensure that any effects are appropriately managed.</p>	<p>Seeks to include new permitted activity as follows:</p> <p><b>xxx-Rx: Emergency service facilities</b> <u>Activity status: Permitted</u></p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other cosequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard</p>	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.90	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency's main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB-S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure and that new connections under the water supply bylaw will not be granted where there is insufficient capacity available within the water supply network for the proposed activity.</p>	<p><b>To include a new performance standard as follows:</b></p> <p><b>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</b></p> <p><u>1. All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u></p> <p><u>2. Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p><u>Matter of discretion:</u></p> <p><u>1. The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p>Or</p> <p><b>To similar effect.</b></p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to</p>	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Objectives /LIZ-O2: Activities in the Light Industrial Zone	Alec Duncan	288.137	Support	<p>Supports LIZ-O2 to the extent that industrial activities in this zone are of a suburban scale and have low water needs reflecting the infrastructural capacity of the area they are located in.</p>	<p>Retain as notified.</p>	Open Submission



# LIZ - Light Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Objectives /LIZ-O4: Non-industrial activities	Alec Duncan	288.138	Amend	<p>Opposes LIZ-O4 as currently proposed, as it excludes the establishment of land use activities within the Light Industrial zone unless the activity is ancillary to the primary industrial use of the land.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency may need to establish new fire stations within the Light Industrial zone in order to continue to achieve emergency response commitments as development occurs and populations change. As such, Fire and Emergency seek to amend LIZ-O4 to enable the establishment of activities where there is a functional and / or operational requirement for the activity to locate within the Light Industrial zone.</p>	<p><b>Amend as follows:</b></p> <p><b>LIZ-O4: Non-industrial activities</b></p> <p>Non-industrial activities are not located in the zone unless the activity is ancillary to the primary industrial use of the land <u>or has a functional and / or operational need to locate in the zone.</u></p>	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Policies /LIZ-P4: Non-industrial and ancillary activities	Alec Duncan	288.139	Amend	<p>Seeks to amend LIZ-P4 to acknowledge that non-industrial activities such as emergency service facilities that provide for the health, safety and wellbeing of the community are compatible with industrial activities.</p>	<p><b>Amend as follows:</b></p> <p>...</p> <p>Avoid non-industrial activities in the Light Industrial Zone except when the activity is compatible with industrial activities and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. supports and is directly related to a permitted or consented industrial activity located on the same site, or</li> <li>b. provides essential services to people employed in businesses located in the zone.</li> </ul> <p><u>provides for the health, safety and wellbeing of the community.</u></p>	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /LIZ - Light Industrial Zone - Rules Table	Alec Duncan	288.140	Support	<p>Supports LIZ-R4 insofar as the storage of tyres is a permitted activity where a fire management plan is prepared and implemented for the site and, where the standards are not met, a discretionary activity status is triggered.</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
LIZ - Light Industrial Zone /Assessment criteria /LIZ-AC4: Tyre storage not meeting permitted activity standards	Alec Duncan	288.141	Support	<p>Supports LIZ-AC4 as it considers the fire management plan required by LIZ-R4, to minimise the risks of fires starting and maximise the chances of any fires being extinguished as quickly as possible.</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

# GIZ - General Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Standards Table /GIZ-S5: Fences	Susan Dallas	25.30	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan. (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Standards Table /GIZ-S5: Fences	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.28	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Introduction	Sera Chambers	150.216	Amend	Considers that the introduction should be amended to ensure that existing adjoining property/landowners have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Amend the introduction to add that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the General Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Issues /Land use associated with heavy industrial activities can place demands on traffic, waste treatment, and stormwater infrastructure. Heavy industrial activities need buffers or separation distances from other activities and sensitive environments. They operate for longer hours, require large buildings and lot sizes, generate noise, and can have off-site effects that are difficult to mitigate and can conflict with land uses in adjacent zones.	Sera Chambers	150.217	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the General Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Issues /Industrial zoned land that has adequate infrastructure and services is a limited resource that needs to be used efficiently. There are already constraints associated with the capacity of infrastructure servicing some of the areas zoned for industrial activities. In addition, the reticulated three waters network has capacity limitations that cannot be exceeded. Heavy industry typically generates high demands on services that either cannot be met or potentially could monopolise any remaining capacity at the expense of a large number of sites/activities within the wider zone.	Sera Chambers	150.218	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the General Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Issues /The operational needs of some industrial activities include products and services that generate large traffic volumes. Industrial activities tend to take advantage of locations along the rail and key arterial road networks or in close proximity to the Napier port. Traffic and truck queuing can affect accessibility to neighbouring zones and the amenity values of nearby residential neighbourhoods as well as having a significant impact on the road network.	Sera Chambers	150.219	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the General Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission

# GIZ - General Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Issues /Reverse sensitivity arises when newly established land uses complain about an established industrial activity that produces adverse effects at adjacent properties. This may ultimately result in operating constraints being placed on existing authorised industrial activities.	Sera Chambers	150.220	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the General Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Issues /The Taradale Road frontage of the Onekawa industrial area is particularly suited to industrial activities with a retail component and compatible activities with similar traffic generation effects and product offerings that require a site with a profile to a busy road. Examples of such activities are the sale and hire of machinery, equipment, and supplies used for industrial, building, or landscape purposes, including trade retail activities. The land use pattern on Taradale Road, Onekawa reflects a market preference for the location of such activities in Napier.	Sera Chambers	150.221	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the General Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Objectives /The General Industrial Zone enables the ongoing operation and development of industrial activities where reticulated services are available, and adverse effects on sites with important or significant values are avoided.	Sera Chambers	150.222	Amend	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the General Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Objectives /Non-industrial activities are not located in the zone unless the activity is ancillary to the primary industrial use of the land or is a trade retail activity within the Taradale Road Specific Control Area.	Sera Chambers	150.223	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the General Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Objectives /Avoid incompatible activities and sensitive activities that are likely to generate reverse sensitivity (which may compromise existing industrial activities) from locating within the zone.	Sera Chambers	150.224	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the General Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /Enable industrial activities in the General Industrial Zone, recognising that these activities generate higher levels of light, noise, vibration, odour, and high volumes of traffic while maintaining residential amenity in adjacent areas at a level that recognises the industrial setting and is reasonable for the location.	Sera Chambers	150.225	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the General Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission

# GIZ - General Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /Avoid heavy industrial activities in the General Industrial Zone, and industrial activities that have significant water use or infrastructure requirements (wet industry), unless appropriate services are available and the adverse effects from discharges, odour, traffic, and noise can be maintained at acceptable levels.	Sera Chambers	150.226	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the General Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /Minimise the adverse effects on adjacent residential and open space zones by: requiring screening or landscaping at the interface of the zones to mitigate adverse visual effects; controlling bulk and location of buildings and structures and outdoor storage, and restricting the location and operation of industrial activities that have adverse noise effects.	Sera Chambers	150.227	Amend	Considers that the policy should be amended to ensure that existing adjoining property/landowners have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Amend the policy to add that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the General Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /Avoid the establishment and operation of sensitive land uses and non-industrial activities unless the activity is compatible with the adverse effects generated from industrial activities and: supports and is directly related to a permitted or consented industrial or manufacturing activity located on the same site; provides essential services to people employed in businesses located in the zone, or is a trade retail activity within the Taradale Road Specific Control Area.	Sera Chambers	150.228	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the General Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /Avoid activities that are sensitive to the types of effects generated by industrial activities from establishing in the General Industrial Zone.	Sera Chambers	150.229	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the General Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /Enable trade retail activities requiring a road profile and vehicle access for customers within the Taradale Road Specific Control Area with specific controls to ensure: industrial zoned land is used efficiently by industrial related activities or those with similar effects, and that the retail function and viability of the centre zones are not undermined.	Sera Chambers	150.230	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the General Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /GIZ-R6A	Sera Chambers	150.231	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the General Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission

# GIZ - General Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Standards Table	Sera Chambers	150.232	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the General Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Standards Table	Sera Chambers	150.233	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the General Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Standards Table	Sera Chambers	150.234	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the General Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Standards Table	Sera Chambers	150.235	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the General Industrial Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Standards Table /GIZ-S1: Yards	Sheena McGuire	168.122	Amend	Notes that the GIZ Chapter does not contain a specific rail corridor building setback standard and there is no yard setback that applies to the corridor. Considers that setbacks are a common planning tool used to ensure the safe and efficient operation of activities such as the railway corridor, particularly when it may come into conflict with adjacent land uses. For rail, a setback provides a safe physical distance between a building and the railway corridor boundary. Heavy freight trains run on the railway lines through the Napier City District. Considers that without a sufficient setback, people painting their buildings, clearing gutters or doing works on their roof will need to access or foul the rail corridor. If a person or object encroaches onto the rail corridor, there is a substantial risk of injury or death for the person entering the rail corridor. Considers that a setback control has obvious safety benefits for the users of the land adjoining the rail corridor and users of the rail corridor. Also notes the efficiency benefits for rail operations, mitigating against the risk of train services being interrupted by unauthorised persons or objects entering the rail corridor. Considers that without appropriate setback requirements, there is significant risk of adverse health and safety effects impacting people locating and working in proximity to the railway corridor. Seeks a new clause within LIZ-S1 to require a 5m setback for structures and buildings from the rail corridor. Matters of discretion are also sought in the case that the setback cannot be achieved.	Amend as follows: ... <u>4. Rail corridor setbacks:</u> <u>No part of any building or structure may be located within a 5m setback from a boundary shared with a rail corridor.</u> Matters of discretion are: 1. Purpose of the standard; 2. Quality living environments; 3. Amenity values; 4. Character of the area; 5. Operation and maintenance of watercourses and open drains; <u>6. The safe and efficient operation of the rail network;</u> <u>7. Compatibility with the surrounding environment; and</u> 8. The reason for the reduced setback.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /GIZ-P2: Heavy industrial activities	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.2	Amend	Where sufficient servicing can be provided, and the heavy industrial activity meets the noise limits and high traffic generating activities rules, they are appropriate in the GIZ. Minor changes are required to the policy to reflect the supporting rule framework in the District Plan.	Amend wording as follows (or similar relief): <del>Avoid</del> <u>Require</u> heavy industrial activities in the General Industrial Zone, and industrial activities that have significant water use or infrastructure requirements (wet industry), <del>unless to locate</del> <u>where</u> appropriate services are available and <u>to</u> <del>manage</del> <u>manage</u> the adverse effects <u>including</u> from discharges, odour, traffic, and noise <del>can be maintained at</del> acceptable levels.	Open Submission

# GIZ - General Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /GIZ-R1: Any industrial activity and any building or structure associated with industrial activities	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.3	Amend	The discharge of contaminants is managed by the Hawkes Bay Regional Council and cannot be directly controlled through the District Plan. Further, there is no clear definition of "Heavy or Wet Industrial Activity". The key matter to manage is to ensure that industrial activity with high water needs/wastewater generation only locates where it can be adequately serviced. Stormwater and wastewater servicing are managed through bylaws. Where connection to council-reticulated networks is not approved through the bylaws, that activity should locate elsewhere in the region.	Amend rule as follows:  Where:  <del>1. There are no discharges of contaminants from the site, except</del> Stormwater and wastewater is discharged through a connection to the council-reticulated networks. 2. The goods or services offered as an ancillary activity must be manufactured, processed, repaired, serviced, or warehoused on the site. <del>3. The activity is not a Heavy or Wet Industrial Activity.</del>  <u>Note: Stormwater and wastewater/trade waste may only be discharged to a council-reticulated network in compliance with the Napier City Council Stormwater Bylaw and the NCC Trade Waste and Wastewater Bylaw. Capacity limitations may apply in some areas.</u>	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /GIZ-R1: Any industrial activity and any building or structure associated with industrial activities	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.4	Amend	Industrial activity that is not adequately serviced by reticulated networks is generally not appropriate and therefore a non-complying activity status should apply. Site-specific solutions can be sought through GIZ-R1B and would be assessed against the policy framework, including GIZ-P2.	Amend activity status of GIZ-R1B from Discretionary to Non-complying.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /GIZ-R9: Heavy industrial activities	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.5	Oppose	The proposed definition of Heavy Industry is not clear enough to be linked to an activity status. Effects from heavy industrial activities can be managed through noise limits in receiving zones, the high trip generating activity rule, and the requirement for sites to be connected to Council's network in accordance with the relevant bylaws (that apply in addition to the District Plan). Discharge consents from HBRC, if required, would require assessment of the receiving environment including having regard to location.	Delete Rule GIZ-R9.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Issues /GIZ-I5: Adverse effects on residential and open space amenity values	Grant Russell	202.52	Support	The submitter supports the GIZ-I5: Adverse effects on residential and open space amenity values Issue. It has regard to the "rail and key arterial road networks or in close proximity to the Napier port," and the operational needs of industrial activities that generate large traffic volumes. The Port traffic volumes involve containers to and from the Port along Ahuriri Bypass (SH50) and the rail network.	Retain GIZ-I5: Adverse effects on residential and open space amenity values as the operational needs of some industrial activities include products and services that generate large traffic volumes; industrial activities tend to take advantage of locations along the rail and key arterial road networks or in close proximity to the Napier Port. Also, traffic and truck queuing can affect accessibility to neighbouring zones and the amenity values of nearby residential neighbourhoods as well as having a significant impact upon the road network.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Objectives /GIZ-O4: Industrial activities in close proximity to Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (the Ahuriri estuary) or residential zones	Grant Russell	202.53	Support	Supports the GIZ-O4: Industrial activities in close proximity to Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (the Ahuriri estuary) or residential zones Objective. The Port currently operate two container storage areas at Thames Street. It has in place HBRC consented low impact designed stormwater ponds to store stormwater prior to discharges to the waterway and into Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (the Ahuriri estuary).	Retain GIZ-O4: Industrial activities in close proximity to Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (the Ahuriri estuary) or residential zones Objective in its entirety.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /GIZ-P1: Activities in General Industrial Zone	Grant Russell	202.54	Support	The submitter supports GIZ-P1: Activities in General Industrial Zone Policy. It recognises and enables industrial activities, setting and location appropriateness within the General Industrial Zone (GIZ).	Retain GIZ-P1: Activities in General Industrial Zone Policy in its entirety as notified.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /GIZ-P7: Reverse sensitivity	Grant Russell	202.55	Support	Supports GIZ-P7: Reverse sensitivity Policy. Considers that this enabling policy is 'fit for purpose' for industrial activities in the General Industrial Zone (GIZ).	Retain GIZ-P7: Reverse sensitivity Policy in its entirety.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /GIZ-R1: Any industrial activity and any building or structure associated with industrial activities	Grant Russell	202.56	Amend	Considers GIZ-R1: Any industrial activity and any building or structure associated with industrial activities Rule criteria appears to capture discharge of contaminants to air. Napier Port seek clarity on this intention from NCC and its workability.	Amend the GIZ-R1: Any industrial activity and any building or structure associated with industrial activities Rule to clarify whether or not the criteria captures the discharge of contaminants to air and if so, how this will work in practice.	Open Submission

# GIZ - General Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /GIZ-R6: Storage of shipping containers	Grant Russell	202.57	Oppose	Opposes GIZ-R6: Storage of shipping containers Rule based on Clause 3. Operating hours and the inclusion and the reference to Ahuriri. It appears to restrict the movement of shipping containers via the State Highway (i.e Ahuriri Bypass (SH50)) and rail to and from the Port (and other areas) along Ahuriri. It is unclear how shipping containers will be able to utilise the existing container storage area at Thames Street, Pandora.	Amend GIZ-R6: Storage of shipping containers Rule Clause 3. as follows: <del>3. Operating hours for the delivery or movement of shipping containers are between 8 a.m. and 10 p.m. on the same day only within the General Industrial Zone areas of Ahuriri, Onekawa, and Awatoto.</del>	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /GIZ-R7: Activities listed in GIZ-R1 to GIZ-R5 infringing standards GRZ-S1 - GRZ-S9	Grant Russell	202.58	Amend	The submitter considers GIZ-R7: Activities listed in GIZ-R1 to GIZ-R5 infringing standards GRZ-S1 - GRZ-S9 Rule is unclear on the Activity status. If the activity is not Permitted is the Activity then assessed as Discretionary or Restricted Discretionary? (as referred to under GIZ-R7).	Amend GIZ-R7: Activities listed in GIZ-R1 to GIZ-R5 infringing standards GRZ-S1 - GRZ-S9 Rule to better clarify the Activity relationship between GIZ-R1A: Any industrial activity and any building or structure associated with industrial activities. Activity Status: Permitted.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Standards Table /GIZ-S6: Stormwater run-off	Grant Russell	202.59	Amend	The submitter opposes the GIZ-S6: Stormwater run-off Standard Clause 2. with this matter arguably better addressed in the Stormwater Bylaw 2020. They would like to be consulted with as to how this Rule in particular is implemented.	Seeks to amend in part the GIZ-S6: Stormwater run-off Standard Clause 2. to enable consultation with Napier Port over implementation / effectiveness.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Standards Table /GIZ-S6: Stormwater run-off	Grant Russell	202.60	Amend	The submitter considers that Napier Port should be regularly consulted with regarding the implementation of Clause 3. of the GIZ-S6: Stormwater run-off Standard.	Seeks to be consulted with as an amendment regarding the implementation of the GIZ-S6: Stormwater run-off Standard Clause 3. Whereby all roof surfaces on a building, structure, or storage area are to be constructed from inert materials or painted with non-metal-based paint and maintained in good order.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Standards Table /GIZ-S2: Height	Ryan Andrew Schnell	204.2	Oppose	Considers that when looking at any of the industrial areas it seems that the building height restrictions do not take into account some of the trends we are seeing in the international market places, who are facing similar issue to those we are experiencing. Due to the lack of available space in industrial areas, multi-level warehousing facilities are becoming more common and while the submitter does not have any current plans for such facilities it is something that they are exploring further.	Seeks for the maximum building height limit to be increased to allow for buildings higher than two storey.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /General	Hus Narsai	205.5	Amend	Supports the provision for trade supply retail activity within the General Industrial zone. Considers that the retail and display floor space GFA limit of 200m <sup>2</sup> should be removed.	Bunnings seeks for specific provision for trade suppliers in the General Industrial Zone with the following activity statuses: Trade suppliers – Permitted	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Standards Table /GIZ-S6: Stormwater run-off	Hus Narsai	205.6	Oppose	Opposes the proposed restrictions on impervious areas as they limit the potential scale of development. Considers there are other mechanisms to control stormwater run-off such as the provision of detention and retention for example.	Delete the proposed restrictions on impervious area to provide for greater flexibility in the site layout that would better suit functional requirements of Bunnings.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Issues /GIZ-I8: Reverse sensitivity	Georgina McPherson	215.154	Support	The Fuel Companies support the active management and provision for reverse sensitivity effects in the GIZ. The terminals are an 'industrial activity', as defined in the Proposed Plan, and it is critical that the zone provides for these activities on that basis that it not suited to any other zone in the Proposed Plan (other than a bespoke special purpose zone). Currently the GIZ rules do not clearly provide for the terminal facilities, including potential defining the facilities as 'heavy industry', and there is a significant risk that it would default to a non-complying activity. While service stations are not industrial activities, they are considered appropriate and compatible with the purpose of the GIZ zoning.	Retain GIZ-I8, GIZ-O3, and GIZ-P7 as notified.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Objectives /GIZ-O3: Incompatible activities and reverse sensitivity	Georgina McPherson	215.155	Support	The Fuel Companies support the active management and provision for reverse sensitivity effects in the GIZ.	Retain GIZ-I8, GIZ-O3, and GIZ-P7 as notified.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /GIZ-P7: Reverse sensitivity	Georgina McPherson	215.156	Support	The Fuel Companies support the active management and provision for reverse sensitivity effects in the GIZ.	Retain GIZ-I8, GIZ-O3, and GIZ-P7 as notified.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Objectives /GIZ-O2: Non-industrial and ancillary activities	Georgina McPherson	215.157	Amend	The Fuel Companies support the general intent of the objective, which provides for some non-industrial activities in the GIZ zone, but consider that it does not adequately provide for service stations that are otherwise appropriate and compatible with an industrial zoning. The objective should be amended to recognise that activities such as service stations can appropriately locate in the GIZ zone without compromising the purpose, efficiency or functionality of the zone.	Amend GIZ-O2 as follows: GIZ-O2: Non-industrial and ancillary activities Non-industrial activities are not located in the zone unless the activity is ancillary to the primary industrial use of the land, <u>will not compromise the efficiency or functionality of the zone for industrial activities</u> , or is a trade retail activity within the Taradale Road Specific Control Area.	Open Submission

# GIZ - General Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /GIZ-P6: Non-industrial and ancillary activities	Georgina McPherson	215.158	Amend	This policy is supported to the extent that it recognises non- industrial activities that are compatible with the adverse effects generated from industrial activities, but an amendment is required consistent with the change sought in objective GIZ-O2 to recognise that non-industrial activities, such as service stations, can appropriately locate in the GIZ zone.	Amend GIZ-P6 as follows: GIZ-P6: Non-industrial and ancillary activities Avoid the establishment and operation of sensitive land uses and non-industrial activities unless the activity is compatible with the adverse effects generated from industrial activities and: a. supports ... c. is a trade retail activity within the Taradale Road Specific Control Area, <u>or</u> <u>d. does not compromise the efficiency or functionality of the zone for industrial activities.</u>	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /General	Georgina McPherson	215.159	Oppose	The GIZ rules do not provide for service stations via a specific service stations rule or as a commercial activity. Rule GIZ-R3 only provides for ancillary retail activity or trade supply retail activity (relating to industrial, building and construction, or landscaping purposes). As a consequence, service stations are a non-complying activity under GIZ-R8 for land use or development that is not otherwise provided for, including any alterations or additions to existing service stations. The Fuel Companies consider that this is overly restrictive considering the purpose of the zone and the compatibility of service stations with other activities in the zone.	Add new rule to GIZ as follows: <u>GIZ-RX: Service stations GIZ-RXA</u> <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u> <u>GIZ-RXB</u> <u>Activity status where standards are not met:Restricted</u> <u>Discretionary</u> <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>2. The matters of discretion stated for the relevant GIZ standard(s).</u>	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /GIZ-R1: Any industrial activity and any building or structure associated with industrial activities	Georgina McPherson	215.160	Oppose	The terminals are an 'industrial activity and it is critical that the zone provides for these activities on that basis that they are not suited to any other zone in the Proposed Plan (other than a bespoke special purpose zone). While rule GIZ-R1 provides for general industrial activities, it is doubtful that the existing terminal facilities would comply with the rule conditions. Condition 1 would capture all contaminant discharges from the site, including air discharges. The management of discharges and its effects is not a territorial function and would duplicate the management approach under the the Hawke's Bay Regional Resource Management Plan provisions. The bulk storage of fuels at the terminals may not meet the requirement of condition 2 in terms of goods being "manufactured, processed, repaired, serviced, or warehoused on the site", nor is it clear what the purpose of this requirement is over and above the need for an activity to meet the definition of 'industrial activity' in order to be considered under this rule. In relation to condition 3, 'heavy industry' is defined as "is industry that requires a large area of land; involves large-scale processing of, or large-scale manufacturing of goods; involves large factories; and may produce objectionable odour, dust, and noise emissions." The Fuel Companies consider that this definition is ambiguous and lacks certainty. It is considered that the demarcation between heavy and other industrial activities should be clearly established through rule standards, rather than through an ambiguous definition. A discretionary or non-complying activity status is inappropriate for the existing terminal facilities, including any alterations or additions to those facilities, which are regionally significant infrastructure.	Amend the conditions on rule GIZ-R1A (permitted activity) to address the following matters: 1. Delete condition 1 and 2 in GIZ-R1A, and 2. Delete 'heavy' industrial activities from condition 3 so that it only restricts wet industrial activity, and 3. Include GIZ standards relating to heavy industrial activity, if appropriate (subject to this clearly excluding the existing terminal activities, such that they would fall to be considered under the more general definition of 'industrial activity'). In addition, amend GIZ-R1B to apply a discretionary activity status only where the conditions of the rule are not met and provide a RD status, by way of GIZ-R7, for any infringements of the zone standards, as follows: GIZ-R1B <u>Activity Status where conditions <del>and standards</del> are not met:</u> <u>Discretionary</u>	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /GIZ-R7: Activities listed in GIZ-R1 to GIZ-R5 infringing standards GRZ-S1 - GRZ-S9	Georgina McPherson	215.162	Oppose	As notified the rule would apply to all GIZ zoned land, even if the adjoining zone is not GRZ or the GIZ activities are located some distance from the GRZ land. A rule on one zone that requires compliance with the standards of another zone in inappropriate, especially where the GIZ standards and GRZ standard relate to the same matter and there is a conflict between the respective zone standards. It is assumed that reference to the GRZ standards in this rule is a cross-referencing error and that it should in fact reference the GIZ standards.	Amend rule GIZ-R7 to require compliance with the GIZ standards rather than those of the general residential zone: GIZ-R7: Activities listed in GIZ-R1 to GIZ-R5 infringing standards <del>GRZ-S1 - GRZ-S9</del> <u>GIZ-S1 to GIZ-S6</u> <u>Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary</u>	Open Submission



# GIZ - General Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /GIZ-R9: Heavy industrial activities	Georgina McPherson	215.163	Oppose	Fuel Companies are concerned the definition of 'heavy industry' and associated restrictions on heavy industrial activities through the rules may inappropriately restrict the operation, maintenance, upgrade and development of their existing bulk fuel storage activities. The relief on rule GIZ-R1 instead seeks that GIZ standards are developed for heavy industrial activity, where appropriate (subject to this clearly excluding the existing terminal activities).An industrial activity that does not comply with the GIZ standards, including any heavy industry standards, would be subject to a consent (discretionary activity) under GIZ-R1B.	Amend rule GIZ-R9 as follows: GIZ-R9: <del>Heavy</del> <u>Wet industrial activities</u> <u>Activity Status: Non-complying</u> OR, in the alternative: GIZ-R9: <u>Heavy industrial activities</u> <u>Activity Status: Non-complying</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>1. The activity does not comply with GIZ Standards for heavy industry.</u> <u>(Note – if this alternative relief is adopted then appropriate standards would need to be developed for heavy industry. This submission does not propose those standards on the basis that the terminals are not heavy industry and the proposed GIZ remain applicable (subject to the changes sought to those standards)).</u>	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Standards Table /GIZ-S1: Yards	Georgina McPherson	215.164	Oppose	Fuel Companies are concerned that the yard setback (clause 2.c.) requires service stations and transport depots to be setback at least 6m from the road boundary. This provision is out of place and inconsistent with the nature of the zone. In addition, it is also unclear whether this provision applies to service station and transport depot buildings and structures or the entire activity. The broad nature of the definition of structure means that it captures all man-made structures fixed to land, including a boundary fence or signage, requiring it to meet the yard setbacks. This will have (unintended) consequences for a large number of industrial zoned activities, many of which require fences for security purposes, and the yard standard will trigger the need to a consent for those activities. In addition, a separate standard GIZ-S5 applies to fences, so fences should be excluded from GIZ-S1. Retrofitting sites to meet the standards would be expensive and difficult. An alternative to landscaping eg a fence, should be considered.	Amend yard standard GIZ-S1 as follows: 4. Front yards: a. no part of a structure ( <del>excluding a fence</del> ) or building (including eaves and guttering) is erected closer than 2 m to the road boundary of all roads not listed in GIZ-S1(2)(b). b. no part of a structure ( <del>excluding a fence</del> ) or building (including eaves and guttering) is erected closer than 3 m from the following road boundaries: i. Austin Street; ii. Hyderabad Road; iii. Gloucester Street; iv. Niven Street;v. Pandora Road; vi. Taradale Road;vii. Thames Street, and viii. Wakefield Street. <del>e. no service station or transport depot is closer than 6 m to the road boundary.</del> 5. Other yards: d. no part of a structure ( <del>excluding a fence</del> ) or building (including eaves and guttering) is located closer than 6 m from the boundary of any land not zoned for industrial activities; e. a minimum of a 2-metre-wide landscaped area comprised of indigenous plants must be provided parallel to the boundary of any land not zoned for industrial activities. This landscaped area must create a visual screen with a minimum height of 1.8 m, and c. the landscaped area must be	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Standards Table /GIZ-S6: Stormwater run-off	Georgina McPherson	215.165	Oppose	However, the Fuel Companies' have a number of concerns with the requirements of GIZ-S6. GIZ-S6(1) seeks to prevent the discharge of stormwater to the Ahuriri estuary, or any waterbody or open drain. That is, the clause seeks to control stormwater discharges to the environment that are regulated by the Regional Council under the Hawke's Bay Regional Resource Management Plan, and do not properly fall within the territorial authority functions in the RMA. The clause results in inappropriate duplication of function and consenting requirements and is opposed. GIZ-S6(2) could be interpreted to require the total removal of contaminants prior to its discharge. This contradicts other guidelines and standards such as the MfE Guidelines where 15mg/l of total petroleum hydrocarbons is regarded as a best practice threshold. Any requirement for use of interceptors should apply only to the 'at- risk' parts of activities, rather than taking a zone based approach. GIZ-S6(3) duplicates this requirement for inert roofing in SW-S2 in the stormwater chapter and is unnecessary. Under standard GIZ-S6(4), the Fuel Companies query the appropriateness of setting an impervious area threshold in the zone where stormwater runoff is appropriately managed, and to convert paved surfaces to permeable surfaces.	Delete standard GIZ-S6: Stormwater run-off.	Open Submission

# GIZ - General Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Objectives /GIZ-O1: Enabling industrial activities	Shravan Miryala	217.39	Support	Supports the active management and provision for reverse sensitivity effects in GIZ.	Retain GIZ-O1 as notified	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Objectives /GIZ-O2: Non-industrial and ancillary activities	Shravan Miryala	217.40	Amend	Supports the active management and provision for addressing non- industrial and ancillary activities in GIZ. Considers that the existing lawfully established service stations and transport depots must be acknowledged/provided for through the Objectives and Policies and is further reflected in the proposed relief sought where service stations and transport depots are requested to be listed as permitted activity below in this submission.	Amend GIZ-O2 to include service stations GIZ-O2: Non-industrial and ancillary activities Non-industrial activities are not located in the zone unless the activity is ancillary to the primary industrial use of the land, <u>will not compromise the efficiency or functionality of the zone for industrial activities</u> , or is a trade retail activity within the Taradale Road Specific Control Area.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Objectives /GIZ-O3: Incompatible activities and reverse sensitivity	Shravan Miryala	217.41	Support	Supports the active management and provision for reverse sensitivity effects in GIZ.	Retain GIZ-O2 as notified.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /GIZ-P1: Activities in General Industrial Zone	Shravan Miryala	217.42	Amend	Supports the active management and provision for addressing non- industrial and ancillary activities in GIZ. Considers that the existing lawfully established service stations and transport depots must be acknowledged/provided for through the Objectives and Policies and is further reflected in the proposed relief sought. Refer to original submission for full details)	<b>Amend</b> Policy GIZ-P1: Activities in General Industrial Zone as follows: Enable industrial activities in the General Industrial Zone, <u>and other supporting activities</u> , recognising that these activities generate higher levels of light, noise, vibration, odour, and high volumes of traffic while maintaining residential amenity in adjacent areas at a level that recognises the industrial setting and is reasonable for the location.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /GIZ-P6: Non-industrial and ancillary activities	Shravan Miryala	217.43	Amend	Supports the active management and provision for addressing non- industrial and ancillary activities in GIZ. The existing lawfully established service stations and transport depots must be acknowledged/provided for through the Objectives and Policies and is further reflected in the proposed relief sought . Refer to original submission for full details	Amend GIZ-P6 as below by excluding service stations GIZ-P6: Non-industrial and ancillary activities a. Avoid the establishment and operation of sensitive land uses and non-industrial activities unless the activity is compatible with the adverse effects generated from industrial activities and :b. supports and is directly related to a permitted or consented industrial or manufacturing activity located on the same site; c. provides essential services to people employed in businesses located in the zone, or d. is a trade retail activity within the Taradale Road Specific Control Area. or e. <u>does not compromise the efficiency or functionality of the zone for industrial activities.</u>	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /GIZ-P7: Reverse sensitivity	Shravan Miryala	217.44	Support	Supports the active management and provision for considering reverse sensitivity effects in GIZ.	Retain Policy GIZ-P7 as notified	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /GIZ-R1: Any industrial activity and any building or structure associated with industrial activities	Shravan Miryala	217.45	Amend	Supports Rule GIZ-R1A in principle but notes that activities will be assessed as Non-complying activities which is onerous especially for land zoned GIZ.	Clarify whether Rule GIZ-R1A applies to service stations; truck stops and Terminals and ancillary activities.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /General	Shravan Miryala	217.46	Oppose	Opposes as GIZ rules do not provide for service stations via a specific service stations rule or as a commercial activity. Notes that rule GIZ-R3 only provides for ancillary retail activity or trade supply retail activity (relating to industrial, building and construction, or landscaping purposes). so service stations are a non-complying activity under GIZ-R8 for land use or development that is not otherwise provided for, including any additions or alterations to existing service stations. Considers that this is overly restrictive considering the purpose of the zone and the compatibility of service stations with other activities in the zone. Considers it is appropriate that the rule also provides for transport depots, consistent with that provided in rule MUZ-R16 for the Mixed Use Zone.	Add new rule to GIZ as follows: <u>GIZ-RX: Service stations and transport depots GIZ-RXA</u> <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u> <u>GIZ-RXB</u> <u>Activity status where standards are not met:</u> <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>1. The matters of discretion stated for the relevant GIZ standard(s).</u>	Open Submission

# GIZ - General Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Standards Table /GIZ-S4: Outdoor storage of materials and products (excluding storage of shipping containers)	Shravan Miryala	217.47	Amend	Notes that Standard GIZ-S4 (outdoor storage) requires all outdoor storage areas, to be fully screened by a close-boarded or similar solid fence or wall of a minimum height of 1.8m or a 2-metre-wide planting strip so that it is not visible from public view and from any adjoining site in a residential or open space zone. However, considers that Outdoor storage is not defined and the standard provides no additional clarification. Seeks amendment or clarity to ensure that the standard does not relate to storage of fuel in above ground tanks.	Amend Standard GIZ-S4 to exclude above ground storage of fuel at truck stops, as follows: GIZ-S4(6)All outdoor storage areas or stockpiles: a. must be screened from the public view and from any adjoining site in a residential or open space zone by: i. a close-boarded or similar solid fence or wall of a minimum 1.8 m in height, or ii. a 2-metre-wide planting strip consist of shrubs and hedge or tree plantings. <u>This standard does not apply to aboveground tanks at truck stops or service stations.</u> And/or Clarify through a new definition or note what is intended by 'outdoor storage', including ensuring above ground tanks are not considered 'outdoor storage'.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Standards Table /GIZ-S6: Stormwater run-off	Shravan Miryala	217.48	Oppose	Supports managing stormwater from sites where hazardous substances or contaminants pose a risk, noting Z Energy's existing adherence to Ministry for the Environment 1998 Environmental Guidelines for Water Discharges from Petroleum Industry Sites in New Zealand . However, considers that GIZ-S6 clause (1), seeks to regulate stormwater discharges to the environment already under the jurisdiction of the Regional Council. Considers the existing Hawke's Bay Regional Resource Management Plan provisions already provide an efficient and effective approach to managing stormwater discharges from industrial and trade premises, with no need to duplicate the regulation of discharges from such sites at a district level. Acknowledges the intent of standard GIZ-S6(2) regarding interceptor traps, but disputes the requirement for total contaminant removal, suggesting it conflicts with established guidelines such as the MfE Guidelines where 15mg/l of total petroleum hydrocarbons is regarded as a best practice threshold. Petroleum industry activities are undertaken in compliance with the MfE Guidelines and are widely accepted in plans as being best practice. Notes that not all sites in the General Industrial Zone handle or store hazardous substances,therefore considers that an interceptor trap may not be necessary or may not be the only or most appropriate method of treating / managing stormwater from sites with a General Industrial Zoning. Considers that setting an impervious area threshold in standard GIZ-S6(3) may be inappropriate, noting that it may be unreasonable for existing fully developed sites to convert paved areas to permeable surfaces. These sites will have existing operational requirements and that paving of surfaces can be an appropriate means of managing the risks associated with HAIL sites and contaminated soils, for which an industrial zone is likely to be the most appropriate location. Considers standard GIZ-S6 duplicates existing controls provided in the Proposed Plan	Delete standard GIZ-S6: Stormwater run-off.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone	Frank Spencer	224.1	Amend	More clarity around stormwater attenuation and management is required.	Seeks to have more clarity.	Open Submission

# GIZ - General Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules	Sean Thompson	225.15	Amend	<p>The submitter considers that it is not self-evident from the analysis and rationale in the proposed plan, including in terms of s 32 RMA, why relocated buildings should be classified as non-complying in the NCZ, LCZ, LFRZ, LIZ and GIZ. It is accepted that relocated buildings should be discretionary in the Natural Open Space Zone, and there may be urban design and other considerations applicable to the Town Centre Zone and City Centre Zone which warrant different treatment.</p> <p>Since a 2004 Central Otago Environment Court decision most local authorities in New Zealand have either adopted permitted activity classification for relocated buildings (with no standards) or provided for permitted activity status with prescribed performance standards.</p>	<p>Seeks that the GIZ Rules to be amended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Provide for relocated buildings as a permitted activity in all relevant zones, excepting where a specified heritage or conservation or urban design consideration applies;</li> <li>b. For the relocated building rules in all zones, the removal of the requirement to deposit a monitoring fee at the same time as submitting the relocated building report;</li> <li>c. Amending the performance standards in relation to relocated buildings in accordance with the wording in the attached Schedule 1 (which can be found in the attached submission), to provide for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. modification of the performance timeframes such that relocation on permanent foundation is required within two months, and twelve months is allowed for the completion of all reinstatement works;</li> <li>ii. provision for a pre-inspection report in the same or similar form as found in Schedule 2 (which can be found in the attached submission);</li> <li>iii. For relocated buildings in the Light Industrial Zone (LIZ) and General Industrial Zone (GIZ), the further amendment of performance standards removing the need for a pre-inspection report and monitoring fee.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Consequential or further relief including to the relevant objectives, policies and provisions of the proposed plan in order to give effect to relief sought. (The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)</p>	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone	Berkett Commercial 2021 Limited Brendon Berkett	228.1	Amend	<p>Submitter provides a background to the site and organisation. Berkett Commercial 2021 Ltd (BCL) owns a 4 ha Rural Zoned property at 129 Awatoto Road, Napier, intended for future industrial use within the Main Rural Zone. Notes that there is a demand for suitable zoned land for earthworks and civil construction contractor yards in Napier, with limited availability within the district. Considers that Business Land Capacity Assessment (BLCA) underestimates the demand for industrial land, especially for specific users like earthworks and civil construction contractors. Notes the proposed reliance on the Deferred Airport Zone for industrial land, instead of implementing the HPUDS allocation for industrial extension at Awatoto, is challenged by the BCLA. The BCLA cautions that the proposed industrial land supply strategy is critically reliant on the Deferred Airport Zone land being available to provide 42 ha of plan enabled industrial land supply for future industrial development. The BCLA advises that if this land is not available, there is insufficient capacity across all of the industrial environment zones and a further 30.5 ha of industrial land capacity is required to address the minimum requirements of the NPS UD. This states it is incompatible with the growth aspirations and operational requirements of Hawke's Bay Airport Limited as outlined in their Notice of Requirement lodged with NCC, putting the industrial land supply strategy and the Council's compliance with NPS UD at risk. Notes the updated 2100 1% coastal inundation modelling indicates potential impacts on existing industrial land in Pandora, leading to increased demand for unaffected land elsewhere. Considers that the fragmented ownership patterns in the Pandora industrial area will complicate individual mitigation measures, necessitating a community-level intervention. Considering these factors, submitter opposes the proposed district plan's failure to zone the indicative HPUDS Awatoto industrial extension as General</p>	<p>Amend to rezone the properties at 129 Awatoto Road, 133 Awatoto Road, 149 Awatoto Road, 54 McLeod Road and 60 McLeod Road to General Industrial Zone. Refer to original submission for proposed zoning pattern shown at Attachment 1. Notes that the properties are a combination of LUC 2 and 3 land, but benefit from the HPUDS indicative industrial allocation. Notes that the title configuration provides five blocks of land that can be readily assembled to provide a single or multiple coherent development areas, or that can provide for standalone development in association with a basic structure plan. The land across the area is generally flat with limited existing development across the area that can often serve as an impediment to replacement development. The land is at the limit of the recently release 2100 1% 8.5 ssp/rcp coastal inundation modelling, with indicated depth of generally less than 750mm across the five properties. As large parcels of vacant land, considers that this inundation could be readily addressed by land filling to an immunity level at the time of development and that this hazard does not therefore preclude realistic site development.</p>	Open Submission

# GIZ - General Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /GIZ-R2: Office accommodation	Berkett Commercial 2021 Limited Brendon Berkett	228.2	Oppose	Considers that GIZ-R2A does not provide for industrial suite users that require large open yards and small office areas, with no other buildings on site. Considers that, where the office building was the only required building, regardless of the office floorspace, it would be classified as a discretionary activity.	Notes that provision is required for General Industrial Zone sites to have office floorspace in the absence of other buildings on the site by way of a minimum allowance in addition to the 35% of total floorspace allowance. Amend addition of allowance for 200m2 of office floorspace to GIZ-R2A 1. b., as follows (additional text underlined): b. must be limited <u>to the greater of 200m2 gross floor area</u> <u>or</u> 35% of the gross floor area of buildings on the site.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Standards Table /GIZ-S4: Outdoor storage of materials and products (excluding storage of shipping containers)	Berkett Commercial 2021 Limited Brendon Berkett	228.3	Amend	Considers that for clarity and in the interests of proper environmental management, point 7 of the condition list should reference the potential requirement for HBRC discharge consent for the storage of any material on a site that is likely generate contaminated leachate.	Seek the addition of a clarification advice note to condition 7 of GIZ-S4 to provide the following clarification (additional text underlined) 7. The storage of material likely to generate contaminated leachate is located on sealed areas and pretreated prior to being drained to the reticulated network or a treatment area. <u>Please note that discharge of contaminated leachate on a site may require discharge consent from Hawke's Bay Regional Council.</u>	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /General /General	Alicia McKinnon	230.3	Amend	Opposes and considers that it is not appropriate for the objectives, policies, and rules for the proposed (GIZ) General Industrial Zone in Ahuriri to apply to the area highlighted as the blue bounded area as per the submission. Also, considers it inappropriate to relax the rules applying to this area given the close proximity to the Residential Zone. Stronger rules through the amendment are required to minimise the negative effects on residential amenity.	Seeks to amend the area highlighted in blue of the submission through its removal from the (GIZ) General Industrial Zone and its rezoning instead as (MUZ) Mixed Use Zone consistent with its current zoning under the Operative District Plan.(The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /GIZ-R5: Storage of tyres	Alicia McKinnon	230.4	Amend	Considers that allowing the storage of tyres in the new General Industrial Zone (GIZ) in Ahuriri as a Permitted activity is particularly concerning given the close proximity to the bulk oil facilities and nearby residential dwellings. The adverse effects of the activity have the potential to be significant in this Zone.	Seeks to amend Rule GIZ-R5, GIZ-R5B / create a new rule to make the storage of tyres a non-complying activity within the proposed new General Industrial Zone (GIZ) in Ahuriri.(The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Objectives /GIZ-O2: Non-industrial and ancillary activities	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.94	Support	Supports both GIZ-O2 and GIZ-P2, as they enable nonindustrial activities or sensitive land uses where they are compatible with the zone. The Ministry considers some educational facilities to be compatible where they include work skills training centres where people are trained on industrial based skills. These facilities are only compatible with industrial zones and should be provided for within the zone.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /GIZ-P6: Non-industrial and ancillary activities	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.95	Support	Supports both GIZ-O2 and GIZ-P2, as they enable nonindustrial activities or sensitive land uses where they are compatible with the zone. The Ministry considers some educational facilities to be compatible where they include work skills training centres where people are trained on industrial based skills. These facilities are only compatible with industrial zones and should be provided for within the zone.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - Taradale Road Specific Control Area - Rules Table /General	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.96	Amend	Amend LIZ as certain industrial training facilities that can only locate in industrial areas should be allowed. However, agrees that schools and childcare facilities should be a non-complying activity within the industrial zones.	Seeks to amend as follows: <u>Educational facilities</u> <u>Where: It is a training facility that is ancillary to industrial activities</u> <u>Activity Status: Discretionary.</u>	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /General	Sam Goddard	238.19	Amend	Considers that explicit provision should be made for wholesaler within the zone given it is unclear if a Gilmours development will fall under a retail or industrial activity.	Seeks for specific provision for wholesaler in the General Industrial Zone with the following activity statuses: Wholesaler – Permitted	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Standards Table /GIZ-S6: Stormwater run-off	Sam Goddard	238.20	Oppose	Opposes as the proposed restrictions on impervious areas limit the potential scale of development. Acknowledges the need to manage infrastructure demands resulting from development within the General Industrial Zone but considers that there are other mechanisms to control stormwater run-off such as the provision of detention and retention for example.	Delete the proposed restrictions on impervious area to provide for greater flexibility in the site layout that would better suit functional requirements of the submitter	Open Submission

# GIZ - General Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Introduction	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.93	Amend	Considers the GIZ - General Industrial Zone Introduction should be amended as the main area of concern is the statements that due to the GIZ areas being located close to sensitive receiving environments, and the limited space available in Napier City to provide for zoning for industrial activities, new and expanded heavy (and wet) industrial activities in the GIZ are to be avoided. The introduction also states these industrial activities are to be directed to Hastings. Avoiding heavy industrial activities in appropriately zoned industrial zones does not reflect a logical resource management approach. The GIZ has been established to provide for industrial activities, including heavy industrial activities, as required by Objective SD-UFD-P8 (subject to the amendments sought above). Providing for heavy industry in GIZ areas, and more specifically providing for, or not restricting, the ability of existing heavy industry, such as Ravensdown's Napier Works, to continue to expand and/or operate effectively, is what effective and efficient land use planning under the RMA requires.	Amend the fourth and fifth paragraphs of the GIZ - General Industrial Zone Introduction as follows :Infrastructure that is designed to cater for industries that use water and discharge trade waste as part of their manufacturing processes is mainly located in the Pandora part of the General Industrial Zone. Any trade waste associated with the expansion or development of new industrial activities within the zone is to be treated and disposed of in accordance with the Napier City Council Tradewaste and Wastewater Bylaw. There is limited capacity for new <u>or expanded wet heavy</u> industry within the General Industrial Zone. Instead, this <del>wet new</del> <u>heavy</u> industry is directed to Hastings, where there is some capacity for new <del>wet heavy</del> industry. <u>In addition,</u> <del>H</del> heavy industrial activities can have significant adverse effects that cannot always be contained on site and are often incompatible with sensitive land uses and ecological areas <del>surrounding</del> <u>located beyond</u> the General Industrial Zone. Larger lot sizes are often needed to accommodate these types of industrial activities in order to internalise their effects. <u>Accordingly,</u> <del>T</del> the expansion of heavy industry is to be <u>avoided managed</u> in the General Industrial Zone <del>due to when</del> <u>the activity is located in</u> the close proximity of receiving environments that are <u>potentially</u> sensitive to the adverse effects that heavy industry generates <del>and the potential contaminant discharges.</del> <u>However,</u> it also needs to be recognised that there is some established heavy industry in the General Industrial Zone where relocation <u>to Hastings</u> is not practical, and some expansion	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Objectives /GIZ-O1: Enabling industrial activities	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.94	Amend	Considers that Objective GIZ-O1: Enabling industrial activities should be amended as the objective does not provide for the on-going operation and development of industrial activities outside of reticulated areas. This fails to recognise the significant contribution that existing industries make to the city, and the wider region, and the extent of capital investment in buildings and plants associated with existing activities that are present in areas where there is no reticulated servicing. This is of relevance to Ravensdown given that their Napier Works at Awatoto is located outside of a reticulated area and is therefore serviced by on-site means. In addition, remediation or mitigation of adverse effects from appropriately located industrial activities in GIZ areas, on areas with important or significant values, rather than only avoidance of adverse effects, may also be a valid resource management approach. This should be recognised in the objective.	Amend the Objective GIZ-O1 as follows: The General Industrial Zone enables the on-going operation and development of industrial activities <del>where reticulated services are available, and while</del> adverse effects on sites with important or significant values are avoided., <u>remedied or mitigated.</u>	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Objectives /GIZ-O2: Non-industrial and ancillary activities	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.95	Support	Supports Objective GIZ-O2: Non-industrial and ancillary activities as only providing for non-industrial activities to establish in the GIZ when they are directly associated with, or ancillary, to the industrial activity taking place at a site, is an appropriate resource management approach. This approach minimises the potential for reverse sensitivity effects to arise within the zone.	Retain Objective GIZ-O2 as notified.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Objectives /GIZ-O3: Incompatible activities and reverse sensitivity	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.96	Support	Supports Objective GIZ-O3: Incompatible activities and reverse sensitivity as it is appropriate to avoid the establishment of incompatible and sensitive activities in the GIZ - General Industrial Zone.	Retain Objective GIZ-O3 as notified.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Objectives /GIZ-O4: Industrial activities in close proximity to Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (the Ahuriri estuary) or residential zones	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.97	Oppose	Opposes GIZ-O4: Industrial activities in close proximity to Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (the Ahuriri estuary) or residential zones as it is not agreed that industrial activities located appropriately within industrial zones should be required to be managed such that they have 'low impact' on nearby residential activities. Zoning, within the PDP, should have been developed to manage and control reverse sensitivity effects where residential zones adjoin industrial zones.	Amend Objective GIZ-O4 as follows: Objective GIZ-O4: Industrial activities in close proximity to the Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (the Ahuriri estuary) <del>or residential zones</del> Industrial activities near to the Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (the Ahuriri estuary) <del>or residential zones</del> are located, and designed and <u>managed to have a low impact minimise adverse effects on health, safety, cultural and environmental values associated with the estuary.</u>	Open Submission

# GIZ - General Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /GIZ-P1: Activities in General Industrial Zone	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.98	Oppose	Opposes Policy GIZ-P1: Activities in General Industrial Zone as the Policy identifies that a level of residential amenity is to be maintained in adjacent areas, assumably irrespective of the zoning of adjacent land, and at levels that recognises the industrial setting. This aspect of the policy is confusing and does not make sense. It is also noted that other policies address issues of off-site effects and amenity expectations for non-industrial zones (for example, GIZ-P4). In addition, zoning, within the PDP, should have been developed to manage and control reverse sensitivity effects where residential zones adjoin industrial zones. For these reasons, this component of the policy is not appropriate and not needed. Rather, it is considered that reference to an obligation for industrial activities in the zone to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the surrounding environment is more appropriate. Finally, consistent with the requested amendments to SD-UFD-P8 (above) and the requested deletion of GIZ-P2 (below), providing for the heavy industrial activities in the zone, subject to ensuring that appropriate control and management of the adverse effects associated with such activities, is also requested.	Amend Policy GIZ-P1 as follows: Enable industrial activities, <u>including heavy industrial activities</u> , in the General Industrial Zone, recognising that these activities generate higher levels of light, noise, vibration, odour, and high volumes of traffic, while <del>maintaining residential amenity in adjacent areas at a level that recognises the industrial setting and is reasonable for the location.</del> <u>avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on the surrounding environment.</u>	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /GIZ-P2: Heavy industrial activities	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.99	Oppose	Opposes GIZ-P2: Heavy industrial activities as this policy is not consistent with Objective GIZ-O2 which aims to enable the on-going operation and development of industrial activities within the zone. In addition, none of the zone of objectives identify that the establishment of heavy industry in the zone is to be avoided.	Delete Policy GIZ-P2 in its entirety as follows: <del>Avoid heavy industrial activities in the General Industrial Zone, and industrial activities that have significant water use or infrastructure requirements (wet industry), unless appropriate services are available and the adverse effects from discharges, odour, traffic, and noise can be maintained at acceptable levels.</del>	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /GIZ-P3: Industrial activities are connected to the reticulated network	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.100	Oppose	Opposes Policy GIZ-P3: Industrial activities are connected to the reticulated network as this policy does not appropriately recognise and provide for existing industries in the zone, or their ongoing operation, intensification or future development outside of reticulated areas. Considers this policy therefore does not recognise that there are a range of approaches that are already, or can be, implemented, including on-site treatment and disposal options, to reduce effects from industrial waste, trade waste or stormwater contamination within sites located outside of reticulated areas.	Amend Policy GIZ-P3 as follows: <del>Require that New</del> industrial activities that generate industrial waste, trade waste and potentially contaminated stormwater are to be located where infrastructure services are in place and have sufficient capacity to support the activities and that the quality of the discharge entering the network meets Councils relevant bylaws. <u>Existing industrial activities are to connect to reticulated servicing networks, where such networks are available, and where these networks are not available, the adverse effects on the surrounding environment of on-site service provision are to be appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u>	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /GIZ-P5: Manage industrial activities to avoid adverse effects on water margins and land with sensitive values	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.101	Support	Supports GIZ-P5: Manage industrial activities to avoid adverse effects on water margins and land with sensitive values as it is appropriate to avoid adverse effects on the sensitive environments listed within this policy by adopting the approaches outlined.	Retain Policy GIZ-P5 as notified.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /GIZ-P6: Non-industrial and ancillary activities	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.102	Support	Supports GIZ-P6: Non-industrial and ancillary activities Policy as it is appropriate to avoid the establishment of sensitive and incompatible activities in the zone as outlined in the policy.	Retain Policy GIZ-P6 as notified.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /GIZ-P7: Reverse sensitivity	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.103	Support	Supports GIZ-P7: Reverse sensitivity as it is appropriate to ensure that sensitive activities, that may give rise to reverse sensitivity effects, cannot establish within the zone. While supporting this policy, it is noted that this policy seems to repeat concepts already incorporated into GIZ-P6 (refer to above).	Retain Policy GIZ-P7 as notified.	Open Submission

# GIZ - General Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /GIZ-R1: Any industrial activity and any building or structure associated with industrial activities	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.104	Oppose	Opposes GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rule GIZ-R1: Any industrial activity and any building or structure associated with industrial activities as Ravensdown considers that Condition (1) is too restrictive and that an accommodation should be provided within the condition where the discharge of contaminants is a permitted activity in accordance with a regional plan (i.e., and thus the effects are minor), or where a resource consent authorises the discharge/s. While Ravensdown agrees that new heavy industrial activities should not be provided for as permitted activities under this rule, the rule effectively restricts any development of existing heavy industrial activities in the zone. For example, under this rule, if Ravensdown were to build new storage building at their Napier Works, as currently drafted, a resource consent would be required under Rule GIZ-R9, even if all of the zone standards were complied with. It is considered that Condition (3) should be amended, so that development activities, which do not entail new or expanded manufacturing or processing plants and which are associated with existing heavy industrial activities, can be provided for by this permitted activity rule. Finally, as discussed above in relation to the definition for 'Wet Industry', the deletion of all references to Wet Industrial Activities has been requested. Therefore, a consequential amendment to Condition (3) is required).	Amend Rule GIZ-R1A as follows: GIZ-R1A Activity Status: Permitted Where: 1. There are no discharges of contaminants from the site; except: a. through a connection to the Council reticulated networks; <u>or</u> b. <u>where the discharge of contaminants is a permitted activity in accordance with a regional plan; or</u> c. <u>where a resource consent is held for the discharge of contaminants.</u> 2. The goods or services offered must be manufactured, processed, repaired, serviced or warehoused on the site. The activity is not a <u>new Heavy or Wet Industrial Activity or new or expanded manufacturing or processing plants associated with an existing Heavy Industrial Activity</u> (see Rule GIZ-R89).	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /GIZ-R2: Office accommodation	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.105	Amend	Considers that Rules GIZ-R3A and GIZ-R3A (GIZ-R3: Retail) should be amended as it is considered that the current drafting does not reflect the intent. For example, heavy industrial activities are not permitted activities in the zone. Secondly, the reasoning behind the gross floor restriction is not understood. Condition (a), subject to the amendments requested, means that any office accommodation must be in support of the primary activity taking place at the site. In this context, as the office accommodation is secondary to the site activity, it is considered that the occupiers of the site are best placed to determine how much office space is required in the context of site operations. In addition, the zone standards place additional restrictions on any site buildings, including office accommodation. Finally, it is considered, given that this rule solely relates to office accommodation associated with industrial activities in the zone, that the activity status, where the permitted activity rules are not complied with, should be restricted discretionary, not discretionary.	Amend Rules GIZ-R2A and GIZ-RB as follows: GIZ-R2A Activity Status: Permitted Where: 1. Any office accommodation: <del>a. relates solely to the administration and management of the site activities an industrial or commercial activity otherwise permitted in the General Industrial Zone, and</del> <del>b. must be limited to 35% of the gross floor area of buildings on the site.</del> GIZ-R2B Activity Status where conditions are not met: <u>Restricted</u> Discretionary	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /GIZ-R3: Retail	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.106	Support	Supports GIZ-R3: Retail Rule and GIZ-R3A as these rules are supported as the Rule permits specific retail activities that can be accommodated in the zone. General retail activities, beyond those permitted by this rule, are more than likely to be incompatible with the zone's industrial activities and therefore a discretionary activity consent pathway for these activities is appropriate.	Retain Rule GIZ-R3: Retail as notified.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /GIZ-R4: Hospitality, food, and beverage services	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.107	Support	Supports Rule GIZ-R4: Hospitality, food, and beverage services including GIZ-R4A as the Rule permits food related services in the zone that meet the needs of the zone's workers. Other food related services, beyond those permitted by this rule, are more than likely to be incompatible with the zone's industrial activities and therefore a discretionary activity consent pathway for these activities is appropriate.	Retain Rule GIZ-R4 as notified.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /GIZ-R7: Activities listed in GIZ-R1 to GIZ-R5 infringing standards GRZ-S1 - GRZ-S9	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.108	Amend	The submitter considers that GIZ-R7: Activities listed in GIZ-R1 to GIZ-R5 infringing standards GRZ-S1 - GRZ-S9 should be amended as this Rule requires the specific activities listed in Rules GIZ-R1 to GIZ-R5 to seek a restricted discretionary land use consent, if the activities do not comply with any of the listed standards. However, rather than referring to the GIZ standards, the rule refers to the standards that apply to the General Residential Zone. It is assumed that this is an error.	Amend Rule GIZ-R7 as follows: GIZ-R7: Activities listed in GIZ-R1 to GIZ-R5 infringing standards <del>GRZ-S1—GRZ-S9</del> <u>GIZ-S1 to GIZ-S6...</u>	Open Submission



# GIZ - General Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /GIZ-R8: Land use or development that is not otherwise provided for	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.109	Support	Supports GIZ-R8: Land use or development that is not otherwise provided for as a catch-all Rule.	Retain Rule GIZ-R8 as notified.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /GIZ-R9: Heavy industrial activities	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.110	Oppose	Opposes GIZ-R9: Heavy industrial activities as Ravensdown considers that providing for heavy industrial activities, including the redevelopment and expansion of existing heavy industrial activities (such as Ravensdown's Napier Works), within the GIZ, subject to appropriate controls, is an appropriate planning approach. That is, industrial zones, should provide for industrial activities, including heavy industrial activities. Therefore, Ravensdown opposes restricting, by way of a non-complying activity status, the ability of heavy industrial activities to be able to establish or continue to operate within the GIZ.	Amend Rule GIZ-R9 as follows: GIZ-R9: <u>New #heavy industrial activities and new or expanded manufacturing or processing plants associated with an existing heavy industrial activities</u> Activity Status: <del>Non-complying</del> <u>Discretionary</u>	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Standards Table /GIZ-S1: Yards	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.111	Support	Supports GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Standards Table GIZ-S1: Yards as this standard specifies setbacks from water (6m), as well as front yard (2, 3 or 6m) and other yard setbacks (2 to 6m with landscaping requirements) where the site adjoins another zone. As a permitted activity standard, these yard requirements are supported.	Retain Standard GIZ-S1 as notified in its entirety.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Standards Table /GIZ-S2: Height	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.112	Support	Supports GIZ-S2: Height as Ravensdown is supportive of there not being a maximum height within the GIZ and the 24m maximum height restrict in the Ahuriri GIZ (unless the Airport Height Control Designation applies).	Retain Standard GIZ-S2: Height as notified.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Standards Table /GIZ-S3: Height in relation to boundary	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.113	Support	Supports Standard GIZ-S3: Height in relation to boundary as this proposed standard is appropriate and is therefore supported.	Retain Standard GIZ-S3 as notified.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Standards Table /GIZ-S4: Outdoor storage of materials and products (excluding storage of shipping containers)	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.114	Support	The submitter supports GIZ-S4: Outdoor storage of materials and products (excluding storage of shipping containers) as in the context of new development within the GIZ, the permitted activity management requirements for outdoor storage of materials and products are generally considered appropriate.	Retain Standard GIZ-S4 as notified.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Standards Table /GIZ-S6: Stormwater run-off	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.115	Support	Supports GIZ - General Industrial Zone Standard GIZ-S6: Stormwater run-off as Ravensdown considers that in the context of new development within the GIZ, the permitted activity stormwater management requirements are appropriate.	Retain Standard GIZ-S6 as notified.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /GIZ-P4: Effects on the amenity of adjoining non-industrial zones	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.116	Support	Supports Policy GIZ-P4: Effects on the amenity of adjoining non-industrial zones as it outlines sensible mechanisms for ensuring that potential adverse effects on the adjoining more sensitive zones, if such zones adjoin each other, are appropriately managed.	Retain Policy GIZ-P4 as notified.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /General /General	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.125	Oppose	The submitter considers there are three high-level 'areas of concern' with the PDP. Namely: whether the PDP should have been notified at this point in time given district-wide gaps within the PDP and the fact that fundamental strategy work is currently taking place; significant restrictions on heavy, or wet, industrial activities from establishing or operating in the General Industrial Zone (GIZ); and the rezoning of land adjoining Ravensdown's Napier Works from Rural Production Zone (RPROZ) to General Industrial Zone (GIZ). (Refer to original submission for full reasons)	Seeks the amendments requested within the submission points in <b>Attachment A</b> to ensure the PDP provides sustainable management or resources, namely that the city's land resource will achieve the purpose of the RMA; is in accordance with Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA; provides for the social and economic well-being of the city's people and communities; meets the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; enables the efficient use and development of Ravensdown's assets and operations; and represents the most appropriate means of exercising Council's functions having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /GIZ-R3: Retail	Phil Stickney	263.65	Oppose	Amend GIZ-R3A to enable a larger allowance for showrooms and retail display as the restrictions are unduly restrictive in the context of the types of activities that the GIZ enables. Business benefit from economies of scale and the nature of such activities means that they will not wish or be able to establish easily within other commercial zones.	Amend the rule to remove the 200sqm restriction.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Standards Table /GIZ-S6: Stormwater run-off	Phil Stickney	263.66	Oppose	Opposes GIZ-S6 as the preference is to rely upon stormwater design and techniques which can be demonstrably shown to achieve the coefficient ratings for the zone.	Remove the impervious surface requirement.	Open Submission

# GIZ - General Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /GIZ-P2: Heavy industrial activities	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.144	Support	Supports P2 as it recognises industrial activities can place demand on traffic and offsite effects and ensures there is suitable infrastructure to support the land use.	Retain as notified	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Objectives /General	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.145	Amend	Considers a new objective that provides for industrial activities being located and designed to have low impact on safety and environmental values.	New objective: <u>Industrial activities are located and designed to have a low impact on health, safety, cultural, and environmental values.</u>	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /GIZ-P1: Activities in General Industrial Zone	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.146	Support	Supports P1 and P2 as they recognise industrial activities generate higher volumes of traffic and needs to be at reasonable locations that has appropriate infrastructure and adverse effects of traffic are maintained at an acceptable level.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /GIZ-P2: Heavy industrial activities	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.147	Support	Supports P1 and P2 as they recognise industrial activities generate higher volumes of traffic and needs to be at reasonable locations that has appropriate infrastructure and adverse effects of traffic are maintained at an acceptable level.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /General	Alec Duncan	288.72	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency requires the ability to construct and operate emergency service facilities (i.e., fire stations) in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies. This means new fire stations may be necessary in any zone across the district in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the effects of a fire station can be largely anticipated and, in the most part, do not differ to the effects of many activities that may be anticipated through rural and urban environments.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency requests that emergency service facilities are provided for as permitted activities in the larger, more extensive zones of the district to recognise the critical importance of emergency services to communities. In providing for emergency service facility as a permitted activity would mean that emergency service facilities would be controlled by the subsequent performance standards of each zone (such as height, height in relation to boundary, front yards, building coverage requirements).and the other relevant performance standards in other chapters (i.e., transport) to ensure that any effects are appropriately managed.</p>	<p>Seeks to include new permitted activity as follows: <b><u>xxx-Rx: Emergency service facilities</u></b> <b><u>Activity status: Permitted</u></b></p> <p>Or To similar effect And any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.</p>	Open Submission

# GIZ - General Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.91	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency's main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</p> <p>SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.</p> <p>In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure and that new connections under the water supply bylaw will not be granted where there is insufficient capacity available within the water supply network for the proposed activity.</p>	<p>To include a new performance standard as follows:</p> <p><b>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</li> <li>Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</li> </ol> <p><b>Matter of discretion:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</li> </ol> <p>Or To similar effect.</p> <p>And any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.</p>	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Objectives /GIZ-O2: Non-industrial and ancillary activities	Alec Duncan	288.142	Amend	<p>Opposes GIZ-O2 as currently proposed, as it excludes the establishment of land use activities within the General Industrial zone unless the activity is ancillary to the primary industrial use of the land.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency may need to establish new fire stations within the General Industrial zone in order to continue to achieve emergency response commitments as development occurs and populations change. As such, Fire and Emergency seek to amend GIZ-O2 to enable the establishment of activities where there is a functional and / or operational requirement for the activity to locate within the General Industrial zone.</p>	<p>Amend as follows</p> <p><b>:GIZ-O2: Non-industrial activities</b></p> <p>Non-industrial activities are not located in the zone unless the activity is ancillary to the primary industrial use of the land, <u>has a functional and / or operational need to locate in the zone</u>, or is a trade retail activity within the Taradale Road Specific Control Area.</p>	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /GIZ-P2: Heavy industrial activities	Alec Duncan	288.143	Support	<p>Supports GIZ-P2 insofar it requires avoiding heavy industrial activities and that have significant water use or infrastructure requirements unless appropriate services are available.</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Policies /GIZ-P6: Non-industrial and ancillary activities	Alec Duncan	288.144	Amend	<p>Seeks to amend GIZ-P6 to acknowledge that non-industrial activities such as emergency service facilities that provide for the health, safety and wellbeing of the community are compatible with industrial activities.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>GIZ-P6: Non-industrial activities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Avoid the establishment and operation of sensitive land uses and non-industrial activities unless the activity is compatible with the adverse effects generated from industrial activities and:</li> <li>supports and is directly related to a permitted or consented industrial or manufacturing activity located on the same site;</li> <li>provides essential services to people employed in businesses located in the zone, or</li> <li>is a trade retail activity within the Taradale Road Specific Control Area, <u>or provides for the health, safety and wellbeing of the community.</u></li> </ol>	Open Submission
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /GIZ - General Industrial Zone - Rules /GIZ-R5: Storage of tyres	Alec Duncan	288.145	Support	<p>Supports GIZ-R5 insofar as the storage of tyres is a permitted activity where a fire management plan is prepared and implemented for the site. Where the standards are not met, a restricted discretionary activity status is triggered with a matter of discretion relating to fire risk mitigation methods.</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

# GIZ - General Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
GIZ - General Industrial Zone /Assessment criteria /GIZ-AC3: Tyre storage	Alec Duncan	288.146	Support	Supports GIZ-AC3 as it considers fire risk including the fire management plan required by GIZ-R6, to minimise the risks of fires starting and maximise the chances of any fires being extinguished as quickly as possible.	Retain as notified.	<a href="#">Open Submission</a>

# NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Standards Table /NOSZ-S4: Fences and walls	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.29	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /Policies	Peter Grant	78.15	Amend	Supports retaining and enhancing the natural environment by ensuring that activities, buildings and other structures are compatible with the natural characteristics of the zone. Considers the need to ensure these spaces are accessible to all with the anticipated increase in housing developments, and the proposed introduction of medium and high-density residential zones.	Amend for a clear focus on accessibility to and through spaces in the form of suitable parking and pathways in particular, and provision of adequate resting points which make use of quality seating areas while ensuring structures are compatible with the natural characteristics of the zone.	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Standards Table /NOSZ-S2: Yards	Sheena McGuire	168.123	Amend	Notes that the NOSZ Chapter contains a standard requiring a 6m building setback from any site boundary. Supports this standard but seeks amendment to ensure that the setback applies to structures as well.	Amend as follows: Any part of a building (including eaves and guttering) or structure must not be erected closer than 6m to any site boundary. Any building, fence, permanently fixed structure or part thereof must not be erected closer than 6m from the top of the bank of any watercourse or open drain.	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /Assessment criteria	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.26	Amend	The current assessment criteria in the open space zones refer only to "any values identified in an approved Resource Management Plan". In addition to values, Reserve Management Plans (and plans under the Conservation Act) may refer to activities, structures and other methods. These plans are a relevant consideration under s104 for decision making on resource consents and will assist in ensuring an integrated approach to planning. Therefore the criteria should require wider regard be given to these other plans "	Add a new assessment criteria: <u>Whether the proposal is consistent with the outcomes sought in any relevant adopted reserve management plan, conservation management strategy or conservation management plan.</u>	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Rules Table /NOSZ-R4: Additions, alterations, or new buildings	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.31	Amend	The rules for this zone currently do not permit small scale buildings and structures that support conservation activities, which would be consistent with the objectives for the zone, for example, skink protection structures.	Reword to <u>"The building or structure is for public amenities or directly related to conservation of indigenous flora and/or fauna".</u>	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Rules Table /NOSZ-R3: Community activitiesNOSZ-R3A	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.37	Amend	Community activity is not defined in the PDP and therefore it is unclear what activities are covered by this rule.	- Change term to "Community facility" which is defined. - Change all references in the PDP from Community activity to Community facility for consistency and clarity for plan users.	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Rules Table	Amelia Longley	222.25	Amend	Amendment sought clarifies that any applicant must also refer to Reserves Act legislation and the relevant Reserves Management Plan. This is particularly important for new activities establishing on Council parks. It also clarifies that provisions in other district wide sections of the District Plan may also be relevant.	<b>NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Rules Table</b> <b><u>Note 1: In addition to these provisions of the District Plan, the provisions of the Reserves Act 1977 and associated Reserve Management Plan also apply.</u></b> <b><u>Note 2: It is important to note that in addition to the provisions in this chapter, the following Part 2: District-Wide Matters / General District-Wide Matters may also apply:</u></b> • <b><u>NU – Network Utilities</u></b> • <b><u>TPT- Transport</u></b> • <b><u>EW – Earthworks</u></b> • <b><u>LIGHT – Light</u></b> • <b><u>NOISE - Noise</u></b> • <b><u>SIGN – Signs</u></b> • <b><u>TEMP – Temporary Activities</u></b>	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Rules Table /NOSZ-R1: Maintenance and repair to existing buildings	Amelia Longley	222.26	Oppose	There are no definitions for 'maintenance' and 'repair' (other than in relation to heritage buildings and network utilities). It therefore does not seem relevant to have a specific rule for these types of activities, and they could occur as ancillary to the main activity.	Seeks to delete NOSZ-R1.	Open Submission

# NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Rules Table /NOSZ-R2: Recreational activities	Amelia Longley	222.27	Amend	Insert new definition for informal recreation (as outlined above) and delete clause 2 as it is covered by the definition of recreational activities / informal recreational activities.	Amend as sought and apply consistent format and terminology to Rule NOSZ-R3 Community <del>activities</del> facility <u>activity rule</u> .  <b>NOSZ-R2A</b> <b>Activity Status:</b> Permitted <b>Where:</b> 1. The activity is informal recreation, <del>or and</del> <del>2. Walking and/or bike paths.</del>  <b>NOSZ-R2B</b> <b>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met:</b> Discretionary	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Rules Table /NOSZ-R3: Community activities	Amelia Longley	222.28	Amend	Amend to be consistent with definitions. Noting that the definition of 'community facility' is a National Planning Standards definition and means land and buildings used by members of the community thus covers the facility as well as the activity.	Amend as sought and apply consistent format and terminology to Rule NOSZ-R2 <b>NOSZ-R3: Community activities facility activity</b>	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Rules Table /NOSZ-R3: Community activities	Amelia Longley	222.29	Amend	If submission on Rule NOSZ-R1 is accepted, reference to it in this Rule should be deleted. Condition 1 as currently written requires all 3 conditions to be met to fall within this rule. It is unlikely that an activity will be for all 3 of these activities at one time.	<b>NOSZ-R3A</b> <b>Activity Status:</b> Permitted <b>Where:</b> 1. Provided that any building work associated with the below activities complies with NOSZ-R4, <del>except where it is permitted by NOSZ-R1:</del> a. Education and research facilities directly related to the open space; or b. Information facilities accessory to a permitted activity, <del>and</del> or c. Public amenities  <b>NOSZ-R3B</b> <b>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met:</b> Discretionary	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Rules Table /NOSZ-R4: Additions, alterations, or new buildings	Amelia Longley	222.30	Amend	It is not clear how this rule relates to Rules NOSZ-R2 and NOSZ-R3, noting that the proposed definitions for Community facilities and Recreation activities provides for buildings as well as activities. The term 'addition' can be clarified by a reference to the Gross Floor Area, which is defined in the Interpretation section of the Plan. However the term 'alteration' is not clear and could include 'additions' (already identified), or changes internally or externally (but not an addition). This Rule as currently written, would require all 3 conditions to be met to fall within this rule. It is unlikely that this was the intention, and it is recommended that use of the word 'and' is replaced with 'or'.	Amend as sought and clarify how this rule relates to Rules NOSZ-R2 and NOSZ-R3. <b>NOSZ-R4: Additions to Gross Floor Area, alterations, or new buildings</b> <b>NOSZ-R4A</b> <b>Activity Status:</b> Permitted <b>Where:</b> 1. The building is for public amenities; <u>or</u> 2. The activity is building a fence(s) on the boundary, <u>or and</u> 3. The activity involves observation areas, viewing platforms, and related structures. <b>NOSZ-R4B</b> <b>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met:</b> Discretionary	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Rules Table /NOSZ-R5: Vehicle parking areas	Amelia Longley	222.31	Oppose	Vehicle parking areas are an ancillary activity and therefore fall within the definition of 'recreation activity' and 'community facilities'. In addition, Council is the manager of these spaces and any new vehicle parking areas will be subject to the provisions of a Reserve Management Plan. It is not appropriate or necessary for the District Plan to control these activities.	Seeks to delete rule NOSZ-R5.	Open Submission

# NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Rules Table	Amelia Longley	222.32	Amend	Insert new rule providing for Reserves Maintenance Activities (refer proposed new definition).	<p>Insert new rule as sought (or words to that effect)</p> <p><b><u>NOSZ-R5: Vehicle parking areas</u></b>  <b><u>NOSZ R5: Reserve maintenance activities</u></b>  <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u>  <b>Where:</b>  <b><u>1. The activity complies with all the relevant zone standards</u></b></p> <p><b><u>NOSZ-RX</u></b>  <b>Activity status where activity conditions are not met:</b> Restricted discretionary  <u>Matters of discretion</u>            1. Neighbourhood and landscape character, and            2. Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces.  <b>Notification:</b> Any application under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified</p>	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Rules Table /NOSZ-R6: Activities infringing standards	Amelia Longley	222.33	Amend	Should only apply to permitted activities otherwise potentially could end up with a discretionary or non-complying activity that infringes standards being considered under this rule. Clarification of wording to assist in clearer interpretation of the Plan.	<p><b><u>NOSZ-R6: Permitted Activities infringing standards</u></b></p> <p><b>Activity Status:</b> Restricted Discretionary  <b>Matters of discretion are:</b>            1. The matters of discretion stated for <del>infringing</del> the relevant standard(s) <u>being infringed</u>.</p>	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Rules Table /NOSZ-R7: Relocated buildings	Amelia Longley	222.34	Oppose	Not necessary to have a separate rule for relocated buildings in this chapter. Buildings on NOSZ land require Council consent and must be erected in accordance with a relevant Reserve Management Plan.	Delete rule.	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Rules Table /NOSZ-R9: Residential activities	Amelia Longley	222.35	Oppose	The requirement for managers to live onsite on Council reserves is no longer a Council practice and therefore it is not necessary to have a separate rule for this type of activity. The default Rule NOSZ-R11 is appropriate to cover instances where a Residential activity might be considered. Prohibited activity status is unnecessarily restrictive. The provisions of the Reserves Act 1977, and any relevant RMP would also apply.	Delete rule.	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Rules Table /NOSZ-R10: Industrial activities	Amelia Longley	222.36	Oppose	There is no justification for 'Prohibited activity' status for activities in the Open Space zones and there may be some instance where you would want to permit industrial activities across a reserve eg pipes ancillary to an industrial activity such as Ravensdown example. 'Prohibited activity' status is only used when the activity in question cannot be contemplated in any circumstances, and should be justified in objectives and policies. If it does remain supporting policies linking to the rule should be included to explain why this status has been applied. The default rule NOSZ-R11 (Non-complying activity status) is sufficient to provide for any such applications on NOSZ sites.	Seeks to delete rule NOSZ-R10.	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Rules Table /NOSZ-R11	Amelia Longley	222.37	Support	Support non-complying status for activities not otherwise provided for.	Retain NOSZ-R11.	Open Submission

# NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Rules Table	Amelia Longley	222.38	Amend	Council has a large number of reserves whose primary purpose is to provide for stormwater overflow and drainage activities. It is important that these activities are enabled in the open space zones. It is not clear whether such activities are provided for as network utilities or not. If not, it would be appropriate to define these works (refer proposed definition) and have an associated enabling rule in the open space zones.	Seeks clarification on if the PDP provides for these type of activities elsewhere in the Plan (eg in the Network Utilities chapter) and if not insert a new rule providing for them in the Open Space Zones.  <b>NOSZ-Rxx Stormwater and drainage activities</b>  <b>Activity Status:</b> Permitted <b>Where:</b> 1. The purpose of the reserve is for stormwater or drainage activities; and 2. The stormwater or drainage activities are undertaken by Council (or its contractors)  <b>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met:</b> Non-complying.	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Rules Table	Amelia Longley	222.39	Amend	Insert new rule as sought. The purpose of this rule is to allow for reserve maintenance activities and buildings associated with them to take place within this zone. A definition of 'reserves maintenance activities' is also proposed.	<b>NOSZ-Rxx Reserve maintenance activities</b> - <b>Activity Status: Permitted</b> <b>Where:</b> - <b>1. The purpose of the activity supports the function and maintenance of Council owned reserves; and</b> <b>2. The reserve maintenance activities are undertaken by Council (or its contractors)</b>  <b>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met:</b> Non-complying.	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Standards Table	Amelia Longley	222.40	Support	This note clarifies that activities must comply with the standards.	Retain and apply consistently across all open space zones.	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Standards Table /NOSZ-S1: Height	Amelia Longley	222.41	Amend	Delete matter of discretion matter (3) as it is not relevant to the purpose.	<b>NOSZ-S1: Height</b> <b>Purpose:</b> to maintain the natural character of the open space  1. Buildings and structures must not exceed 4.5 m in height.  <b>Activity Status where standards are not met:</b> Restricted Discretionary <b>Matters of discretion are:</b> 1. Natural and landscape character; 2. Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces, and 3. <del>Quality living environments.</del>	Open Submission



# NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Standards Table /NOSZ-S2: Yards	Amelia Longley	222.42	Amend	Delete matter of discretion matter (3) as it is not relevant to the purpose.	<p><b>NOSZ-S2: Yards</b>  <i>Purpose: to maintain the natural character of the open space; to provide for building maintenance; to provide for a safe and attractive streetscape; to maintain water quality; and provide access to watercourses or open drains for maintenance purposes.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any part of a building (including eaves and guttering) must not be erected closer than 6 m to any site boundary.</li> <li>Any building, fence, permanently fixed structure or part thereof must not be erected closer than 6 m from the top of the bank of any watercourse or open drain.</li> </ol> <p><b>Activity Status where standards are not met:</b> Restricted Discretionary  <b>Matters of discretion are:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural and landscape character;</li> <li>Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces, and</li> <li><del>Quality living environments.</del></li> </ol>	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Standards Table /NOSZ-S3: Building coverage	Amelia Longley	222.43	Amend	Delete matter of discretion matter (3) as it is not relevant to the purpose.	<p><b>NOSZ-S3: Building Coverage</b>  <i>Purpose: to maintain the natural character of the open space.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building coverage must not exceed 1% of the net site area.</li> </ol> <p><b>Activity Status where standards are not met:</b> Restricted Discretionary  <b>Matters of discretion are:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural and landscape character;</li> <li>Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces, and</li> <li><del>Quality living environments</del></li> </ol>	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Standards Table /NOSZ-S4: Fences and walls	Amelia Longley	222.44	Amend	Clarify how these rules will work with fencing requirements in the Residential Zone and achieve consistent fencing around the perimeter of public open spaces.  This rule could result in undesirable outcomes for open space. Consistent fencing, providing for visual surveillance around the park boundaries, is desirable.	<p>Seeks Clarification on how these rules will work with fencing requirements in the Residential Zone and achieve consistent fencing around the perimeter of public open spaces.</p> <p><b>NOSZ-S4: Fence and walls</b>  <i>Purpose: to provide for privacy of sites adjoining open spaces while enabling opportunities for passive surveillance of the public open space</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>Fences or walls (or a combination of these structures) must not exceed the height specified below, measured from the ground level at the boundary:</del> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>Along a common boundary with an adjacent residential or commercial zone, either:</del> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>1.2 m in height; or</del></li> <li><del>1.8 m in height for no more than 50% of the site frontage and 1.2 m for the remainder; or</del></li> <li><del>1.8 m in height if the fence is at least 50% visually open as viewed perpendicular to the front boundary.</del></li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p><b>Activity Status where standards are not met:</b> Restricted Discretionary  <b>Matters of discretion are:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>Natural character, and</del></li> </ol>	Open Submission

# NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /Assessment criteria	Amelia Longley	222.45	Amend	The activity status of an activity determines whether regard should be had to objectives and policies of this plan and not appropriate to have this note here.	When considering an application the Council will have regard to the relevant objectives and policies of this plan, the purpose of the rules and standards, and regard will also be had to the relevant assessment criteria set out below:	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /Assessment criteria /NOSZ-AC1: Additions, alterations, or new buildings not meeting permitted conditions (NOSZ-R4); Relocated buildings (NOSZ-R7)	Amelia Longley	222.46	Amend	Consequential amendment supporting submission on Rules NOSZ-R4 and NOSZ-R7.	<p>NOSZ-AC1: Additions to Gross Floor Area, alterations, or new buildings not meeting permitted conditions (NOSZ-R4); Relocated buildings (NOSZ-R7)</p> <p>When considering an application, the Council will have regard to the relevant objectives and policies of this plan, the purpose of the rules and standards, and regard will also be had to the relevant assessment criteria set out below:</p> <p>Natural and landscape character</p> <p>a. The extent to which the natural and landscape character of the park or reserve is maintained by the location, layout, and external appearance of the proposed building. This includes consideration of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. any values identified in an approved reserve management plan, and</li> <li>ii. any landscape, amenity character, heritage character, and/or ecological values identified by overlays applying to the open space.</li> </ul> <p>b. Whether parking, storage areas, and buildings are adequately screened from adjoining sites or public places and roads by fencing and/or landscaping.</p> <p>c. Whether proposed landscaping is compatible with the natural and landscape character of the surrounding environment. Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces</p> <p>d. The extent to which the site layout and building design positively contribute to the attractiveness of streets and public open spaces.</p>	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /Assessment criteria /NOSZ-AC2: Vehicle Parking areas not meeting permitted conditions (NOSZ-R5)	Amelia Longley	222.47	Oppose	For the same reasons as set out with respect to Rule NOSZ-R5, delete these provisions.	Delete NOSZ-AC2.	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /Assessment criteria /NOSZ-AC3: Recreational activities not meeting permitted standards (NOSZ-R2); Community facilities not meeting permitted standards (NOSZ-R3); Commercial activities (NOSZ-R8); Residential activities (NOSZ-R9)	Amelia Longley	222.48	Amend	Consequential amendment to reflect submission on NOSZ Rules NOSZ-R8 and NOSZ-R9. AC (j) Reference to centres does not seem relevant to consideration of recreational and community facility activities.	<p><b>NOSZ-AC3: Recreational activities not meeting permitted standards (NOSZ-R2); Community facility activities not meeting permitted standards (NOSZ-R3); Commercial activities (NOSZ-R8); Residential activities (NOSZ-R9) Activities not otherwise provided for (NOSZ-R11)</b></p> <p><i>Natural and landscape character</i></p> <p>a. The extent to which the activity would detract from the character and function of the open space, including any values identified in an approved reserve management plan or in a plan overlay.</p> <p>b. The extent to which the activity will contribute to the use, benefit, and enjoyment of the open space.</p> <p><i>Contribution to community wellbeing</i></p> <p>c. The extent to which locating the commercial activity in the Natural Open Space Zone will contribute to the wellbeing of the local community while meeting the intended function of the zone.</p> <p>d. Whether that contribution could be achieved by locating the activity in a zone other than the Natural Open Space Zone.</p> <p><i>Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces</i></p>	Open Submission

# NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Rules Table /NOSZ-R8: Commercial activities	Amelia Longley	222.142	Oppose	Commercial activities associated with associated with clubrooms are not appropriate, as clubrooms themselves have been excluded from Rule NOSZ R2 above. Commercial activities are generally not desirable in the NOSZ Zone and it is not necessary to have a separate rule for these activities. The default Rule NOSZ-R11 is appropriate to cover instances where a Commercial activity might want to be considered. Prohibited activity status is unnecessarily restrictive.	Delete NOSZ-R8.	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Rules Table /NOSZ-R7: Relocated buildings	Sean Thompson	225.16	Support	The Association considers that it is not self-evident from the analysis and rationale in the proposed plan, including in terms of s 32 RMA, why relocated buildings should be classified as non-complying in the NCZ, LCZ, LFRZ, LIZ and GIZ. It is accepted that relocated buildings should be discretionary in the Natural Open Space Zone, and there may be urban design and other considerations applicable to the Town Centre Zone and City Centre Zone which warrant different treatment. Since a 2004 Central Otago Environment Court decision most local authorities in New Zealand have either adopted permitted activity classification for relocated buildings (with no standards) or provided for permitted activity status with prescribed performance standards.	Seeks to amend as follows: b. For the relocated building rules in all zones (including NCZ), the removal of the requirement to deposit a monitoring fee at the same time as submitting the relocated building report; c. Amending the performance standards in relation to relocated buildings in accordance with the wording in the attached Schedule 1 (which can be found in the attached submission), to provide for: i. modification of the performance timeframes such that relocation on permanent foundation is required within two months, and twelve months is allowed for the completion of all reinstatement works; ii. provision for a pre-inspection report in the same or similar form as found in Schedule 2 (which can be found in the attached submission).Consequential or further relief including to the relevant objectives, policies and provisions of the proposed plan in order to give effect to relief sought. (The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /Objectives /NOSZ-O1: Natural Open Space Zone purpose	Trevor Ellis	253.81	Amend	“Natural values” has not been defined in the plan. There have been references to ecological, aquatic, cultural, landscape, amenity values, all which could be considered natural values. For clarity, natural values should either be defined or replaced with another term that has been defined. If it is not defined and/or clarified, it could lead to certain values being missed and/or not appropriately assessed when activities are undertaken in the Natural Open Space Zone. The Natural Open Space Zone is the primary zone protecting the Ahuriri Estuary and Tutaekuri river from inappropriate use and development. To additionally avoid confusion, the word restored should be inserted.	Implement a definition for natural values or replace with a term that has been defined. And Amend the objective as following: NOSZ-O1: Natural Open Space Zone purpose The natural values of the Natural Open Space Zone are retained, restored and enhanced.	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /Objectives /NOSZ-O2: Quality natural open space environments	Trevor Ellis	253.82	Amend	Natural characteristics is not a term defined in the plan and is only used in the NOSZ chapter. By changing the word characteristics to values, or another term as to keep in line with the submission point on NOSZ-O1, it will provide greater clarity on NOSZ implementation.	Amend the objective as following: NOSZ-O2: Quality natural open space environments Development contributes to safe, accessible, and attractive natural open space environments while maintaining the natural <u>values</u> characteristics of the park or reserve.	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /Policies /NOSZ-P1: Activities	Trevor Ellis	253.83	Support	Natural characteristics is not a term defined in the plan and is only used in the NOSZ chapter. considers that by changing the word characteristics to values, or another term as to keep in line with the submission point on NOSZ-O1, it will provide greater clarity on NOSZ-P1’s implementation.	seeks to amend NOSZ-P1 as follows: NOSZ-P1: Activities Manage activities and development in the Natural Open Space Zone to ensure they are compatible with the natural <u>values</u> characteristics of the zone.	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /Policies /NOSZ-P3: Infrastructure and natural hazards	Trevor Ellis	253.84	Amend	Considers that in light of recent severe weather events, it is crucial that Napier implements soft/natural flood defences where possible. Wandering waterways are excellent natural flood defences since the curvature of the pathway slows down the water and thus reduces harm. Another requirement to encourage the implementation of water sensitive design, as defined in the interpretation, and hydraulic control would provide benefit for both stormwater management and indigenous biodiversity.	seeks to amend NOSZ-P3 to include: NOSZ-P3: Infrastructure and natural hazards Maintain the drainage functions of the city and contribute to the resilience of adjacent development including by: a. Combining open space amenity with drainage functions;b. Ensure that linear drainage reserves will be unobstructed by development so that risk from flooding is not increased, <del>and</del> ; c. Recognising the risk of liquefaction and lateral spread along open drains and other waterbodies, and <u>d. Encouraging water sensitive design and hydraulic control.</u>	Open Submission

# NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Rules Table /NOSZ-R1: Maintenance and repair to existing buildings	Trevor Ellis	253.85	Oppose	Considers that maintenance and repair to existing buildings is an incredibly broad activity that could require extensive work to complete. Having no controlled or discretionary aspects to the activity could allow for extensive works being done that would not otherwise be permitted.	Seeks one of the following:Implement some matters for control or discretion to prevent misuse. Or Provide assessment criteria for R1. Or Provide a definition of Maintenance and/or Repair in the interpretation section to assist in the interpretation of this section.	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Rules Table /NOSZ-R5: Vehicle parking areas	Trevor Ellis	253.86	Amend	There is no limit to vegetation clearance under the rule as stands. It is likely that the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter will cover vegetation clearance, but interim protections should be in place to limit vegetation clearance for car parks.	Seeks to amend R5 to include a limit on vegetation clearance for car park creation.	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /Objectives /NOSZ-O1: Natural Open Space Zone purpose	Nichola Nicholson	264.8	Support	Supports in principle the proposed approach of retaining and enhancing natural values of Natural Open Space Zones.	No relief sought.	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /Policies /NOSZ-P2: Quality natural open space environments	Nichola Nicholson	264.9	Amend	Seeks that the PDP includes provisions that propose/require enhancement of the natural environment through the restoration and replanting of indigenous vegetation and indigenous habitats.	Amend policy NOSZ-P2 to require the inclusion of indigenous vegetation and indigenous habitats.	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Rules Table /NOSZ-R11: Activities not otherwise provided for	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.148	Oppose	Notes there is no provision for infrastructure in NOSZ-R1-NOSZ-R10, meaning this activity falls into a non-complying activity status in accordance with NOSZ-R11. Notes sections of the SH designation fall within or adjoin Natural Open Space zoning and notes the non-complying activity status would set an overly restrictive activity status for the development, maintenance and operation of the SH transport network. Seeks amendments in the form of a new rule to provide for the maintenance and operation of infrastructure within the Natural Open Space Zone.	Add a new rule setting a restricted discretionary activity status for the maintenance, repair and operation of existing infrastructure.	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Rules Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.73	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency requires the ability to construct and operate emergency service facilities (i.e., fire stations) in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies. This means new fire stations may be necessary in any zone across the district in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the effects of a fire station can be largely anticipated and, in the most part, do not differ to the effects of many activities that may be anticipated through rural and urban environments.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency requests that emergency service facilities are provided for as permitted activities in the larger, more extensive zones of the district to recognise the critical importance of emergency services to communities. In providing for emergency service facility as a permitted activity would mean that emergency service facilities would be controlled by the subsequent performance standards of each zone (such as height, height in relation to boundary, front yards, building coverage requirements).and the other relevant performance standards in other chapters (i.e., transport) to ensure that any effects are appropriately managed.</p>	<p>Seeks to include new permitted activity as follows:</p> <p><b>xxx-Rx: Emergency service facilities</b> <b>Activity Status:</b> Permitted - N/A</p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.</p>	Open Submission

# NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.92	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency’s main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</p> <p>SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.</p> <p>In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and</p>	<p>Seeks to include a new performance standard as follows:</p> <p><b>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</b></p> <p><u>1. All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u></p> <p><u>2. Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p><u>Matter of discretion:</u></p> <p><u>1. The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p><b>Or</b></p> <p><b>To similar effect.</b></p> <p><b>And</b></p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.</p>	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /Objectives /NOSZ-O1: Natural Open Space Zone purpose	Dr. Chantal Page Natasha Sitarz	289.182	Amend	It is unclear whether “retaining” natural values will require the avoidance of adverse effects of activities.	Amend to: “Adverse effects of activities on tThe natural values of the Natural Open Space Zone are avoided, and these natural values are retained and enhanced.”	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /Policies /General	Dr. Chantal Page Natasha Sitarz	289.183	Amend	Considers several of the natural open space zones in the district are in the coastal environment. The plan should state that the policies of the Coastal Environment chapter also apply to these zones.	Seeks to add: “The policies of the Coastal Environment chapter apply in the coastal environment in addition to those below.” Also see submission point regarding the need for rules in all relevant zones to give effect to the CE objectives and policies.	Open Submission
NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone /General /General	Dr. Chantal Page Natasha Sitarz	289.184	Oppose	Arising from late notification of ECO-chapter.	Seeks to add: “The <b>Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity</b> chapter includes provisions which relate to the Natural Open Space Zone. Where there is a conflict between the Natural Open Space Zone chapter and the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter, the provisions that place greater or additional restrictions on activities with adverse effects on the natural environment will apply”.	Open Submission

# OSZ - Open Space Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Standards Table /OSZ-S5: Fences and walls	Susan Dallas	25.32	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Standards Table /OSZ-S5: Fences and walls	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.13	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone	Hamish Blackberry	50.1	Amend	Considers that Emerson Street between Clive Square and Memorial Square should be pedestrianised and evaluation for the purchase of the adjoining parcel of properties between Dickens, Carlyle, Tennyson, Clive Square West be undertaken for potential future open space and stormwater management.	Seeks an amendment so that Emerson Street between Clive Square and Memorial Square is closed to traffic and the properties between Dickens, Carlyle, Tennyson, Clive Square West are assessed for purchase and zoned Open Space Zone from City Centre Zone.	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone / Policies	Peter Grant	78.16	Amend	Supports provision quality natural open space environments for passive and active recreational opportunities, along with the necessary facilities and structures to support them.  As a city, we should be encouraging more people to make use of all the city has to offer. We saw the shift in the use of public open space environments during Covid pandemic lockdowns and there is an opportunity here to provide spaces that are inclusive.  With our growing older population, we need to make sure these spaces are accessible to all. This is particularly important with the anticipated increase in housing developments, and the proposed introduction of medium and high-density residential zones. Our comments also apply to NOSZ-P2.	Amend for a clear focus on accessibility to and through spaces in the form of suitable parking and pathways in particular, and provision of adequate resting points which make use of quality seating areas while ensuring structures are compatible with the natural characteristics of the zone.	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /Policies	Peter Grant	78.20		Supports protection of parks and reserves through open space and natural space zones to retain green spaces for as housing density increases. Higher density housing areas introduce a need for open spaces so older people (and the wider population) can exercise and enjoy the outdoors if properties have limited outdoor space on site.	Provide for minimum public open space zones, which are easily accessible, in high density residential areas.	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Standards Table	Sera Chambers	150.238	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Open Space Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Standards Table /OSZ-S3: Yards	Sheena McGuire	168.124	Amend	Notes that the OSZ Chapter contains a standard requiring a 6m building setback from any site boundary. Supports this standard but seeks amendment to ensure that the setback applies to structures as well.	Amend as follows: Any part of a building (including eaves and guttering) or structure must not be erected closer than 6m to any site boundary. Any building, fence, permanently fixed structure or part thereof must not be erected closer than 6m from the top of the bank of any watercourse or open drain.	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /Introduction	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.23	Amend	Communicate in the introduction to the zone that the Reserve Management Plan is also relevant to assessing activities and development in the zone.	Insert: "In assessing resource consent applications required under the District Plan, the Council will have regard to the relevant reserve management plan for the area." Consistent with NOSZ.	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /Assessment criteria	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.27	Amend	The current assessment criteria in the open space zones refer only to "any values identified in an approved Resource Management Plan". In addition to values, Reserve Management Plans (and plans under the Conservation Act) may refer to activities, structures and other methods. These plans are a relevant consideration under s104 for decision making on resource consents and will assist in ensuring an integrated approach to planning. Therefore the criteria should require wider regard be given to these other plans "	Add a new assessment criteria: <u>Whether the proposal is consistent with the outcomes sought in any relevant adopted reserve management plan, conservation management strategy or conservation management plan.</u>	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Rules Table /OSZ-R6: CemeteriesOSZ-R6A	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.33	Amend	The cemeteries listed in Schedule 8 of the District Plan are not identified on the planning maps, reducing clarity for plan users. Seek to add these instead as a mapped "Cemetery Control Area".	Amend rule to refer to cemeteries within the mapped "Cemetery Control Area" instead of relying on Schedule 8.	Open Submission

# OSZ - Open Space Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Rules Table /OSZ-R11: Industrial	Amelia Longley	222.14	Oppose	<p>Prohibited activity status for rules in the Open Space Zones/Natural Open Space Zones:</p> <p>Prohibited activity status is an absolute. Maybe some instance where you would want to permit industrial activities across a reserve eg pipes ancillary to an industrial activity. 'Prohibited activity' status is only used when the activity in question cannot be contemplated in any circumstances and should be justified in objectives and policies.</p> <p>If it does remain supporting policies linking to the rule should be included to explain why this status has been applied.</p>	Amend Open Space Zones to delete 'Prohibited activity status' where it currently applies to any rules in the Open Space Zones. Or provide justification for retaining this status.	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Standards Table /OSZ-S5: Fences and walls	Amelia Longley	222.16	Amend	Standards for fences in Open Space zones could result in undesirable outcomes for open space.	Delete these provisions from the Open Space zones or ensure provisions are written to provide for consistent fencing around the perimeter of Council parks and open spaces. Amend relevant residential and open space standards to ensure fencing controls adjacent to open space (including Natural Open Space and Sport and Recreation Zones) will provide for consistent fencing around parks and reserves. I.e. where a fence is higher than 1.2 m, the fencing style beyond the 1.2 m is visually permeable.	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Rules Table	Amelia Longley	222.49	Amend	Amendment sought clarifies that any applicant must also refer to Reserves Act legislation and the relevant Reserves Management Plan. This is particularly important for new activities establishing on Council parks. It also clarifies that provisions in other district wide sections of the District Plan may also be relevant.	<p><u>Note 1: In addition to these provisions of the District Plan, the provisions of the Reserves Act 1977 and associated Reserve Management Plan also apply.</u></p> <p><u>Note 2: It is important to note that in addition to the provisions in this chapter, the following Part 2: District-Wide Matters / General District-Wide Matters may also apply:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· <u>NU – Network Utilities</u></li> <li>· <u>TPT- Transport</u></li> <li>· <u>EW – Earthworks</u></li> <li>· <u>LIGHT – Light</u></li> <li>· <u>NOISE - Noise</u></li> <li>· <u>SIGN – Signs</u></li> <li>· <u>TEMP – Temporary Activities</u></li> </ul>	Open Submission

# OSZ - Open Space Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Rules Table /OSZ-R1: New buildingsOSZ-R1A	Amelia Longley	222.50	Amend	Minor clarification of wording with regard to amenity effects on adjacent neighbours.	<p><b>OSZ-R1: New buildings</b>  <b>OSZ-R1A</b>  <b>Activity Status:</b> Permitted  <b>Where:</b>                      1. The gross floor area of the building does not exceed 50 m<sup>2</sup>, and                      2. With the exception of public amenities the building is located outside of the coastal environment.  <b>Notes:</b>                      1. The above standards apply to each individual building (not cumulatively)                      2. The activity status for the relevant activity(s) to operate within the building, and the associated matters of control/discretion (where applicable) apply in addition to this rule.  <b>OSZ-R1B</b>  <b>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met:</b> Restricted Discretionary  <b>Matters of discretion are:</b>                      1. Neighbourhood and open space character;                      2. Safety, attractiveness and connectivity of streets and public open spaces;                      3. Quality living environments <u>amenity for adjacent residents</u>;                      4. Infrastructure capacity and stormwater management,; and                      5. Coastal environment values (where applicable)  <b>Notification status:</b> Any application under this rule is precluded from being notified on a public or limited basis.</p>	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Rules Table /OSZ-R1A: Relocated buildings	Amelia Longley	222.51	Oppose	As permission is required from Council as landowner and most OSZ land is also land under the Reserves Act and subject to Reserve Management Plans this rule is not necessary.	Delete OSZ-R1A.	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Rules Table /OSZ-R2: Additions, alterations, maintenance and repair to existing buildings	Amelia Longley	222.52	Amend	<p>Rules OSZ-R3 and OSZ-R4, provide for 'recreational activities' and 'community activities'. The PDP definition for 'recreation activities' includes buildings as well as activities. Whilst the term 'community activities' in Rule OSZ-R3 is not defined, there is a NPS definition of 'community facility' that also provides for land and buildings.                      so it is not clear why this rule is necessary.                      Our first preference is this rule is deleted, and the conditions are included as part of Rule OSZ-R3 and OSZ-R4.                      Alternatively, if this rule is retained, it would be helpful to clarify the term 'addition' by including a reference to 'Gross Floor Area', (which is defined in the Interpretation section of the Plan). It is not necessary to capture 'alterations, maintenance and repair' of buildings on reserves in a DP rule.                      Matter of discretion (3) should be amended to read 'open space' environments.</p>	<p>Amend as sought and clarify how this rule relates to Rules OSZ-R3 and OSZ-R4.                      Or alternatively delete rule entirely and amend rules OSZ-R3 and OSZ R4 to include these conditions, activity status where activity conditions are not met and matters of discretion.  <b>OSZ-R2: Additions to Gross Floor Area, alterations, maintenance and repair to of existing buildings.</b>  <b>OSZ-R2A</b>  <b>Activity Status:</b> Permitted  <b>Where:</b>                      1. The gross floor area of the addition does not exceed 50 m<sup>2</sup>, and                      2. The building is located outside of the coastal environment.  <b>Note:</b> The activity status for the relevant activity(s) to operate within the building, and the associated matters of control/discretion (where applicable) apply in addition to this rule.  <b>OSZ-R2B</b>  <b>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met:</b> Restricted Discretionary  <b>Matters of discretion are:</b>                      1. Neighbourhood and open space character;                      2. Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces;                      3. Quality living environments;                      4. Infrastructure capacity and stormwater management, and</p>	Open Submission



# OSZ - Open Space Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Rules Table /OSZ-R3: Recreational activities	Amelia Longley	222.53	Amend	<p>Clarify how this rule relates to Rule OSZ-R2 and amend if necessary.</p> <p><b>OSZ-R3: Recreational activities</b>  <b>Activity Status:</b> Permitted  <b>Where:</b></p> <p><u>1. The gross floor area of the addition does not exceed 50 m<sup>2</sup>, and</u>  <u>2. The building is located outside of the coastal environment.</u></p> <p>NA            Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u></p> <p>-  <u>1. Neighbourhood and open space character;</u>  <u>2. Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces;</u>  <u>3. Quality living open space environments;</u>  <u>4. Infrastructure capacity and stormwater management, and</u>  <u>5. Coastal environment values (where applicable).</u></p> <p>-  <u>Notification status: Any application under this rule is precluded from being notified on a public or limited basis.</u></p>	<p>Seeks Clarification on how this rule relates to Rule OSZ-R2 and amend if necessary.</p> <p><b>OSZ-R3: Recreational activities</b>  <b>Activity Status:</b> Permitted  <b>Where:</b></p> <p><u>1. The gross floor area of the addition does not exceed 50 m<sup>2</sup>, and</u>  <u>2. The building is located outside of the coastal environment.</u></p> <p>NA            Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u></p> <p>-  <u>1. Neighbourhood and open space character;</u>  <u>2. Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces;</u>  <u>3. Quality living open space environments;</u>  <u>4. Infrastructure capacity and stormwater management, and</u>  <u>5. Coastal environment values (where applicable).</u></p> <p>-  <u>Notification status: Any application under this rule is precluded from being notified on a public or limited basis.</u></p>	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Rules Table /OSZ-R4 Community activities	Amelia Longley	222.54	Amend	<p>Clarify how this rule relates to Rule OSZ-R2 and amend if necessary.</p> <p>Amend 'community activities' to be consistent with the NPS definition of 'community facility' activity.</p>	<p><b>OSZ-R4 Community activities facility activity</b></p> <p><b>Activity Status:</b> Permitted  <b>Where:</b></p> <p><u>1. The gross floor area of the addition does not exceed 50 m<sup>2</sup>, and</u>  <u>2. The building is located outside of the coastal environment.</u></p> <p>NA            Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u></p> <p>-  <u>1. Neighbourhood and open space character;</u>  <u>2. Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces;</u>  <u>3. Quality living open space environments;</u>  <u>4. Infrastructure capacity and stormwater management, and</u>  <u>5. Coastal environment values (where applicable).</u></p> <p>-  <u>Notification status: Any application under this rule is precluded from being notified on a public or limited basis.</u></p>	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Rules Table /OSZ-R5: Vehicle parking areas	Amelia Longley	222.55	Oppose	<p>Vehicle parking areas are an ancillary activity and therefore fall within the definition of 'recreation activity' and 'community facilities'.</p> <p>In addition, Council is the manager of these spaces and any new vehicle parking areas will be subject to the provisions of a Reserve Management Plan. It is not appropriate or necessary for the District Plan to control these activities.</p>	Delete rule.	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Rules Table /OSZ-R7: Boat and beach related hire activities	Amelia Longley	222.56	Oppose	<p>There is no apparent reason for singling this activity out from other commercial activities. Include as part of commercial activities rule OSZ-R8.</p>	Delete and provide for as a commercial activity within Rule OSZ-R8.	Open Submission

# OSZ - Open Space Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Rules Table /OSZ-R8: Commercial activities	Amelia Longley	222.57	Amend	<p>Include provision for boat and beach related hire activities</p> <p>In matter of discretion (d) It is more appropriate to refer to 'open space' environments than 'living' environments.</p>	<p><b>OSZ-R8A</b>  <b>Activity Status:</b> Restricted Discretionary  <b>Where:</b>                      1. The activity is for the sale of food and drink (including restaurants, cafes, and licensed premises) and is located within the Marine Parade Recreation Control Area, or                      2. The activity is for the commercial use of recreational clubrooms; <b>or</b>                      3. <u>The activity is for boat and beach related hire activities; and within 100 m of the coastal marine area; and</u>                          i. <u>The activity does not include any permanent buildings; and</u>                          ii. <u>Any signs associated with the activity must be limited to one moveable footpath sign that is removed at the end of each day.</u>  <b>Note:</b> Temporary events are provided for under Rule TEMP-R2  <b>Notification status:</b> Any application under this rule is precluded from being notified on a public or limited basis.  <b>Matters of discretion are:</b>                      1. Open space character and function;                      2. Contribution to community wellbeing;                      3. Safety, attractiveness and connectivity of streets and public open spaces;                      4. Quality <del>living</del> <u>living open space</u> environments;                      5. Vibrancy and vitality of centres, <del>and</del>                      6. Infrastructure capacity and stormwater management; <u>and</u>                      7. <u>Coastal environment values (where applicable)</u></p>	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Rules Table /OSZ-R9: Activities infringing standards	Amelia Longley	222.59	Amend	<p>This rule should only apply to permitted activities otherwise potentially could end up with a discretionary or non-complying activity that infringes standards being considered under this rule.</p> <p>Clarification of wording to assist in clearer interpretation of the Plan.</p>	<p><b>OSZ-R9: Permitted Activities infringing standards</b>  <b>Activity Status:</b> Restricted Discretionary  <b>Matters of discretion are:</b>                      1. The matters of discretion stated for <del>infringing</del> the relevant standard(s) <b>being infringed</b>.  <b>Note:</b> The activity status for the relevant activity, and the associated matters of control/discretion (where applicable) apply in addition to this rule.                      NA</p>	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Rules Table /OSZ-R10: Residential activities	Amelia Longley	222.60	Oppose	<p>Considers the requirement for managers to live onsite is generally no longer required on Council reserves and therefore it is not necessary to have a separate rule for this type of activity. The default Rule NOSZ-R11 is appropriate to cover instances where a Residential activity might be considered. Prohibited activity status is unnecessarily restrictive.</p> <p>The provisions of the Reserves Act 1977, and any relevant RMP would also apply.</p>	Seeks to delete OSZ-R10A.	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Rules Table /OSZ-R11: Industrial activities	Amelia Longley	222.61	Oppose	<p>Considers there is no justification for 'Prohibited activity' status for activities in the Open Space zones and there may be some instance where you would want to permit industrial activities across a reserve e.g. pipes ancillary to an industrial activity such as Ravensdown example.</p> <p>The default rule OSZ-R11 (Non-complying activity status is appropriate to provide for any such applications on NOSZ sites.</p>	Seeks to Delete rule.	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Rules Table /OSZ-R12NA	Amelia Longley	222.62	Support	Support non-complying status for activities not otherwise provided for.	Seeks to retain OSZ-R12.	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Rules Table	Amelia Longley	222.63	Amend	<p>Council has a large number of reserves whose primary purpose is to provide for stormwater overflow and drainage activities.Considers it is important that these activities are enabled in the Open Space zones.</p> <p>It is not clear whether such activities are provided for as network utilities or not. If not, it would be appropriate to define these works (refer proposed definition) and have an associated enabling rule in the open space zones.</p>	<p><u>OSZ-Rxx Stormwater and drainage activities</u>  <b>Activity Status:</b> Permitted  <b>Where:</b>                      1. <u>The purpose of the reserve is for stormwater or drainage activities; andThe stormwater or drainage activities are undertaken by Council (or its contractors)Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: Non-complying</u></p>	Open Submission

# OSZ - Open Space Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Rules Table	Amelia Longley	222.64	Amend	Insert new rule as sought: The purpose of this rule is to allow for reserve maintenance activities and buildings associated with them to take place within this zone. A definition of 'reserves maintenance activities' is also proposed.	<p><b>NOSZ-Rxx Reserve maintenance activities</b>  <b>Activity Status: Permitted</b>  <b>Where:</b>                      1. <u>The purpose of the activity supports the function and maintenance of Council owned reserves; and</u>                      2. <u>The drainage activities are undertaken by Council (or its contractors)</u>  <b>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: Non-complying.</b></p>	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Standards Table	Amelia Longley	222.65	Amend	Considers there is currently there is no link between the rules and standards.	<p>Seeks to insert a condition in each rule                      OR                      Amend to insert a note as sought;                      AND apply in a consistent manner across all Open Space Zones  <u>All activities must comply with all of the following permitted activity standards set out below:</u></p>	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Standards Table /OSZ-S1: Height	Amelia Longley	222.66	Amend	Clarify wording and intention of standard with respect to residential amenity.	<p><b>OSZ-S1: Height</b>  <b>Purpose:</b> <i>to maintain an open space character that complements the character of the neighbourhood while facilitating appropriate activities; to minimise effects on the quality of <u>the residential amenity</u> for neighbours' living environment.</i>                      1. Buildings and structures must not exceed 10 m in height  <b>Activity Status where standards are not met:</b> Restricted Discretionary  <b>Matters of discretion are:</b>                      1. Purpose of the standard;                      2. Neighbourhood and open space character;                      3. Safety, attractiveness and connectivity of streets and public open spaces;                      4. Quality <u>living amenity environments</u> for <u>adjacent residents</u>, and                      5. Coastal environment values (where applicable).</p>	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Standards Table /OSZ-S3: Yards	Amelia Longley	222.67	Amend	Minor amendment to purpose and matter of discretion matter (4) referencing environment. Clarify wording and intention of standard with respect to residential amenity.	<p><b>OSZ-S3: Yards</b>  <b>Purpose:</b> <i>to maintain an open space character that complements the character of the neighbourhood; to provide for building maintenance; to provide for a safe and attractive streetscape; to minimise flooding risk; and provide access to watercourses or open drains for maintenance purposes.</i>                      1. Any part of a building (including eaves and guttering) must not be erected closer than 6 m to any site boundary.                      2. Any building, fence, permanently fixed structure or part thereof must not be erected closer than 6 m from the top of the bank of any watercourse, open drain, identified stormwater detention area and/or overland flow path.  <b>Activity Status where standards are not met:</b> Restricted Discretionary  <b>Matters of discretion are:</b>                      1. Purpose of the standard;                      2. Neighbourhood and open space character;                      3. Safety, attractiveness and connectivity of streets and public open spaces, and                      4. Quality <u>living amenity environments</u> for <u>adjacent residents</u>.</p>	Open Submission

# OSZ - Open Space Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Standards Table /OSZ-S4: Building coverage	Amelia Longley	222.68	Amend	Minor amendment to clarify purpose and matter of discretion matter (4) referencing 'living' environment.	<p><b>OSZ-S4: Building coverage</b>  <i>All Open Space Zones except within the Marine Parade Recreation Control Area</i>  <b>Purpose:</b> to maintain the open space character.  <i>Marine Parade Recreation Control Area</i>  <b>Purpose:</b> to maintain the coastal character while enabling activities which contribute to the vibrancy of the city centre.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building coverage must not exceed 5% of the net site area.</li> <li>Building coverage in the Marine Parade Control Area must not exceed 10% of the net site area.</li> </ol> <p><b>Activity Status where standards are not met:</b> Restricted Discretionary</p> <p><b>Matters of discretion are:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Purpose of the standard;</li> <li>Neighbourhood and open space character;</li> <li>Safety, attractiveness and connectivity of streets and public open spaces;</li> <li>Quality living amenity-environments for adjacent residents, and</li> <li>Coastal environment values (where applicable).</li> </ol>	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Standards Table /OSZ-S5: Fences and walls	Amelia Longley	222.69	Amend	Clarify how these rules will work with fencing requirements in the Residential Zone and achieve consistent fencing around the perimeter of public open spaces. This rule could result in undesirable outcomes for open space. Consistent fencing, providing for visual surveillance around the park boundaries, is desirable.	Seeks to Delete OSZ-S5 or amend to clarify.	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /Assessment criteria	Amelia Longley	222.70	Amend	Considers the activity status of an activity determines whether regard should be had to objectives and policies of this plan and not appropriate to have this note here.	Seeks to amend as follows: When considering an application the Council will have regard to the relevant objectives and policies of this plan, the purpose of the rules and standards, and regard will also be had to the relevant assessment criteria set out below:	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /Assessment criteria /OSZ-AC1: New buildings not meeting permitted conditions (OSZ-R1), Additions, alterations, maintenance and repair to existing buildings not meeting permitted conditions (OSZ-R2), Relocated buildings (OSZ-R1A)	Amelia Longley	222.71	Amend	Seeks a consequential amendment supporting submission on Rule OSZ-R2, and minor amendment referencing 'open space' environment instead of 'living' environment.	<p><b>OSZ-AC1: New buildings not meeting permitted conditions (OSZ-R1), Additions to Gross Floor Area alterations, maintenance and repair to existing buildings not meeting permitted conditions (OSZ-R2), Relocated buildings (OSZ-R1A)</b>  <i>Neighbourhood and open space character</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The extent to which the character of the neighbourhood and of the park or reserve are maintained by the proposed building. This includes consideration of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>any positive characteristics of the neighbourhood identified in a heritage character or amenity character area statement;</li> <li>any values identified in an approved Reserve Management Plan, and</li> <li>any landscape, amenity character, heritage character cultural and/or ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity values identified by overlays applying to the open space.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Within the Marine Parade Recreation Control Area, whether the building will maintain the identified coastal character, landscape character and heritage values associated with the former spit and foreshore location.</li> <li>Whether parking, storage areas and buildings are adequately screened from adjoining sites or public places and roads by fencing and/or landscaping.</li> <li>Whether proposed landscaping is compatible with the landscape character of the surrounding environment.</li> </ol> <p><i>Safety, attractiveness and connectivity of streets and public open spaces</i></p>	Open Submission

# OSZ - Open Space Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OSZ - Open Space Zone /Assessment criteria /OSZ-AC2: Vehicle parking areas not meeting permitted conditions (OSZ-R5)	Amelia Longley	222.72	Oppose	For the same reasons as set out with respect to Rule OSZ-R5 above (and copied below), delete these provisions. 'This rule could result in undesirable outcomes for open space. Consistent fencing, providing for visual surveillance around the park boundaries, is desirable'	Seeks to delete OSZ-AC2.	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /Assessment criteria /OSZ-AC3: Activities infringing standards (OSZ-R9)	Amelia Longley	222.73	Oppose	Considers this criteria does not seem to be relevant for this type of restricted discretionary activity, and there is no similar criteria for the same rule in other Open Space Zones.	Seeks to delete OSZ-AC3.	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /Assessment criteria /OSZ-AC4: Commercial activities (OSZ-R8), Residential activities (OSZ-R10)	Amelia Longley	222.74	Amend	Consequential amendment to reflect submission on Rule OSZ-R10.	Seeks to amend as follows: <b>OSZ-AC4: Commercial activities (OSZ-R8), Residential activities (OSZ-R10)</b> The criteria below will be considered in addition to the relevant objectives and policies of the plan. <i>Open space character and functions</i> a. The extent to which the activity would detract from the character and function of the open space, including any values identified in an approved Reserve Management Plan. b. The extent to which the activity will contribute to the use, benefit and enjoyment of the open space. Contribution to community wellbeing c. The extent to which locating the commercial or entertainment activity in the Open Space Zone will contribute to the wellbeing of the local community. d. Whether the activity proposed in the Marine Parade Recreation Control Area contributes to the vibrancy of the city centre and foreshore location. e. Whether the potential contribution to community wellbeing could be achieved by locating the activity in a zone other than the Open Space Zone. Safety, attractiveness and connectivity of streets and public open spaces f. The extent to which access and parking associated with the activity will provide safe access to the activity for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists. g. Whether the car park is located to: i. facilitate accessibility to the open space including facilities	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Standards Table /OSZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary	Amelia Longley	222.143	Amend	Minor amendment to purpose and matter of discretion matter (d) referencing environment. Clarify wording and intention of standard with respect to residential amenity.	Amend as sought. <b>Purpose:</b> <i>to maintain an open space character that complements the character of the neighbourhood while facilitating appropriate activities; to maintain a reasonable level of sunlight access and minimise effects on the quality of</i> <del><i>the adjacent residential amenity neighbours' living environment.</i></del>  1. Buildings must not project beyond a 45 degree recession plane measured from a point 3 m vertically above ground.  <b>Figure 1 - Height in relation to boundary</b>  2. Where the site abuts an entrance strip or access lot, the furthest boundary of the entrance strip or access lot may be deemed to be the site boundary for the purpose of the standard.  <b>Activity Status where standards are not met:</b> Restricted Discretionary  <b>Matters of discretion are:</b> 1. Purpose of the standard; 2. Neighbourhood and open space character; 3. Safety, attractiveness and connectivity of streets and public open spaces, and 4. Quality <del>living amenity</del> environments for <b>adjacent residents.</b>	Open Submission

# OSZ - Open Space Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Rules Table /OSZ-R1A: Relocated buildings	Sean Thompson	225.17	Support	<p>Considers that it is not self-evident from the analysis and rationale in the PDP, including in terms of s 32 RMA, why relocated buildings should be classified as non-complying in the NCZ, LCZ, LFRZ, LIZ and GIZ. It is accepted that relocated buildings should be discretionary in the Natural Open Space Zone, and there may be urban design and other considerations applicable to the Town Centre Zone and City Centre Zone which warrant different treatment.</p> <p>Since a 2004 Central Otago Environment Court decision most local authorities in New Zealand have either adopted permitted activity classification for relocated buildings (with no standards) or provided for permitted activity status with prescribed performance standards.</p>	<p>Seeks to amend the OSZ - Open Space Zone Rules as follows:</p> <p>b. For the relocated building rules in all zones (including OSZ), the removal of the requirement to deposit a monitoring fee at the same time as submitting the relocated building report;</p> <p>c. Amending the performance standards in relation to relocated buildings in accordance with the wording in the attached Schedule 1 (which can be found in the attached submission), to provide for:</p> <p>i. modification of the performance timeframes such that relocation on permanent foundation is required within two months, and twelve months is allowed for the completion of all reinstatement works;</p> <p>ii. provision for a pre-inspection report in the same or similar form as found in Schedule 2 (which can be found in the attached submission).</p> <p>Consequential or further relief including to the relevant objectives, policies and provisions of the proposed plan in order to give effect to relief sought. (The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)</p>	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Rules Table /OSZ-R12	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.149	Oppose	<p>Notes there is no provision for infrastructure in OSZ-R1-OSZ-R11, leading this activity falling into a non-complying activity status in accordance with OSZ-R12. Notes sections of the SH designation fall within or adjoin Open Space zoning and notes the non-complying activity status would set an overly restrictive activity status for the development, maintenance and operation of the SH transport network. Seeks amendments in the form of a new rule to provide for the maintenance and operation of infrastructure within the Open Space Zone.</p>	<p>Add a new rule setting a restricted discretionary activity status for the maintenance, repair and operation of existing infrastructure.</p>	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone /General	Phil Stickney	279.1	Amend	<p>Notes that the submission is made regarding land accommodating Maraenui Golf Club and Awatoto Golf Course. Notes that Maraenui Club is privately operated while Awatoto Course is public. Notes that both courses were significantly damaged during Cyclone Gabrielle, with efforts made to reinstate the Awatoto Course. Notes the proposed zoning under the Proposed plan: Open Space Zone (OSZ) for part of the sites and Rural Production Zone (RPZ) for the southern extent accommodating the Awatoto Course. Considers that there is no rationale for a "split" zoning over the land given the established land use activities that are undertaken are both recreational activities. Seeks to zone all land encapsulated by golfing activities as OSZ. Considers that the proposed provisions do not reflect the bespoke nature of activities associated with, and required for a golfing land use, which clearly are of a very specific nature. Considers that Rules and Standards for OSZ-R and OSZ-S are too restrictive for golf club activities. Notes the scale of buildings required to support a viable golfing activity and the supporting range of land use activities which are expected including cafes/bar facilities, a golfing goods retail operation, storage facilities and other ancillary infrastructure. Seeks provisions that accommodate golfing activities' specific nature as they also attract the public. Seeks amendment of OSZ provisions or creation of a new Golf Precinct to better manage golfing activities using a bespoke approach. Considers the intention to make the plan more effective in achieving desired outcomes and providing certainty and direction for these activities to avoid adverse environmental effects. Refer to original submission for full reasons.</p>	<p>Seeks that the mapping and provision of a golf precinct and accepted and adopted into the PDP and including such further, alternative, or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in this submission. Notes that changes are aimed at ensuring the proposed provisions align with the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, simplifying interpretation and processing for decision makers, provide clarity for all plan users, and promoting certainty in future planning. Refer to original submission for attached Appendix 1 PREC11 – Golf Course Precinct and Appendix 2 - Precinct Map and zone changes sought</p>	Open Submission

# OSZ - Open Space Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Rules Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.74	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency requires the ability to construct and operate emergency service facilities (i.e., fire stations) in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies. This means new fire stations may be necessary in any zone across the district in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the effects of a fire station can be largely anticipated and, in the most part, do not differ to the effects of many activities that may be anticipated through rural and urban environments.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency requests that emergency service facilities are provided for as permitted activities in the larger, more extensive zones of the district to recognise the critical importance of emergency services to communities. In providing for emergency service facility as a permitted activity would mean that emergency service facilities would be controlled by the subsequent performance standards of each zone (such as height, height in relation to boundary, front yards, building coverage requirements).and the other relevant performance standards in other chapters (i.e., transport) to ensure that any effects are appropriately managed.</p>	<p>Seeks to include new permitted activity as follows:</p> <p><b>xxx-Rx: Emergency service facilities</b>  <b>Activity Status:</b> Permitted - N/A</p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard</p>	Open Submission
OSZ - Open Space Zone /OSZ - Open Space Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.93	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency's main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</p> <p>SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.</p> <p>In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and</p>	<p>To include a new performance standard as follows:</p> <p><b>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</b></p> <p><u>1. All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u></p> <p><u>2. Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p><u>Matter of discretion:</u></p> <p><u>1. The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p><b>Or</b></p> <p><b>To similar effect.</b></p> <p><b>And</b></p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.</p>	Open Submission

# SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /Introduction /General	Janet Gail Bartlett	29.1	Amend	The submitter considers that SARZ provisions are amended to provide for a community swimming pool recreational opportunity.	Seeks that SARZ- Sport and Active Recreation Zone Introduction, Issues, Objectives provisions should reference the desirability of a community swimming pool recreational facility.(Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Standards Table /SARZ-S5: Fences and walls	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.30	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone	Catherine Hawkins	148.3	Amend	Seeks a dog run facility at Park Island and an extension and/or widening of the existing fencing at the Riverside Park dog exercise area.	Seeks a dog run facility at Park Island and an extension and/or widening of the existing fencing at the Riverside Park dog exercise area.	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /Introduction	Sera Chambers	150.236	Amend	Amend to correct spelling mistake and add additional Napier City Council facilities.	Amend MacLean Park to correct spelling - McLean Park Amend to include Napier Aquatic Centre and Ocean Spa	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Standards Table	Sera Chambers	150.237	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Delete on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to continue the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Sport and Active Recreation Zone may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /Introduction	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.24	Amend	Communicate in the introduction to the zone that the Reserve Management Plan is also relevant to assessing activities and development in the zone.	Insert "In assessing resource consent applications required under the District Plan, the Council will have regard to the relevant reserve management plan for the area." Consistent with NOSZOpposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle"	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /Assessment criteria	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.28	Amend	The current assessment criteria in the open space zones refer only to "any values identified in an approved Resource Management Plan". In addition to values, Reserve Management Plans (and plans under the Conservation Act) may refer to activities, structures and other methods. These plans are a relevant consideration under s104 for decision making on resource consents and will assist in ensuring an integrated approach to planning. Therefore the criteria should require wider regard be given to these other plans "	Add a new assessment criteria: <u>Whether the proposal is consistent with the outcomes sought in any relevant adopted reserve management plan, conservation management, strategy or conservation management plan.</u>	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone	Janet Campbell	203.1	Amend	Amend recreational activities to include horse riding. There are a significant number of horses grazing within Napier. Over the past decades opportunities to ride outside of grazing paddocks have become limited as urban areas have spread. Horses have been excluded from developments such as cycle ways. Horses could safely share some pathways with 1.5m of grass. This has been achieved within other councils. Would value NCC supporting HBRC in maintaining horse trails.	Seeks to amend recreational activities definition to include horse riding.	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Rules Table	Amelia Longley	222.75	Amend	Amendment sought clarifies that any applicant must also refer to Reserves Act legislation and the relevant Reserves Management Plan. This is particularly important for new activities establishing on Council parks. It also clarifies that provisions in other district wide sections of the District Plan may also be relevant.	<b>SARZ - Open Space Zone - Rules Table</b>  <b>Note1: In addition to these provisions of the District Plan, the provisions of the Reserves Act 1977 and associated Reserve Management Plan also apply.</b>  <b>Note 2: It is important to note that in addition to the provisions in this chapter, the following Part 2: District-Wide Matters / General District-Wide Matters may also apply:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NU – Network Utilities</li> <li>• TPT- Transport</li> <li>• EW – Earthworks</li> <li>• LIGHT – Light</li> <li>• NOISE - Noise</li> <li>• SIGN – Signs</li> </ul> <b>TEMP – Temporary Activities</b>	Open Submission



# SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Rules Table /SARZ-R1: New buildings	Amelia Longley	222.76	Amend	Uncertain as to where Park Island Control Area is located. The reference to temporary accommodation in condition R1A (2)(a) is unnecessary. Minor amendment to clarify purpose and matter of discretion matter (4) referencing 'living' environment.	Amend as sought <i>and</i> define extent of Park Island n Control Area on planning maps  <b>SARZ-R1A</b> <b>Activity Status:</b> Permitted <b>Where:</b> 1. Outside the Park Island Control Area: a. The gross floor area of the building does not exceed 75 m <sup>2</sup> . 2. Within the Park Island Control Area: a. The building is in a location generally in accordance with those identified on the Park Island Master Plan for buildings or temporary accommodation.  <b>SARZ-R1B</b> <b>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met:</b> Restricted Discretionary <b>Matters of discretion are:</b> 1. Neighbourhood and open space character; 2. Efficient use of the site for sport and active recreation activities; 3. Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces, and 4. Quality <del>living environments</del> amenity for adjacent residents.	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Rules Table /SARZ-R2: Relocated buildings	Amelia Longley	222.77	Oppose	Considers that as permission is required from Council as landowner and most OSZ land is also land under the Reserves Act and subject to Reserve Management Plans this rule is not necessary.	Seeks to delete SARZ-R2.	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Rules Table /SARZ-R3: Additions, alterations, maintenance and repair to existing buildings	Amelia Longley	222.78	Oppose	Other Rules for example SARZ-R4, SARZ-R9 that provide for 'recreational activities' and 'community activities' include the building and activity within the definition, so it is not clear why this separate rule for building is necessary.  Our first preference is this rule is deleted, and the conditions are included as part of Rule SARZ-R4 and SARZ-R9 (and other rules if relevant).  Alternatively, if this rule is retained, it would be helpful to clarify the term 'addition' by including a reference to 'Gross Floor Area', (which is defined in the Interpretation section of the Plan). It is not necessary to capture 'alterations, maintenance and repair' of buildings on reserves in a DP rule. Clearer direction would assist with interpretation of matter of discretion (4).  Amend to ensure rules are written in a consistent manner across the chapters (either include a condition that references the standards/ and or include a note at the start of the rules and standards tables specifying that all rules are subject to the standards set out in the standards table).	Amend as sought and clarify how this rule relates to Rules OSZ-R3 and OSZ-R4  Or alternatively delete rule entirely and amend rules OSZ-R3 and OSZ R4 to include these conditions, activity status where activity conditions are not met and matters of discretion.  <del><b>SARZ-R3: Additions to Gross Floor Area, alterations, maintenance and repair to of existing buildings</b></del> <b>SARZ-R3A</b> <b>Activity Status:</b> Permitted <b>Where:</b> 1. The gross floor area of the addition does not exceed 50 m <sup>2</sup> .  <b>SARZ-R3B</b> <b>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met:</b> Restricted Discretionary <b>Matters of discretion are:</b> 1. Neighbourhood and open space character; 2. Efficient use of the site for sport and active recreation activities; 3. Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces, and 4. Quality <del>living environments</del> <u>amenity for adjacent residents.</u>	Open Submission

# SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Rules Table /SARZ-R4: Recreational activities	Amelia Longley	222.79	Amend	Considers that there is a need to amend to ensure rules are written in a consistent manner across the chapters (either include a condition that references the standards/ and or include a note at the start of the rules and standards tables specifying that all rules are subject to the standards set out in the standards table).	Seeks to amend rule and standards to be consistent across the Open Space Zones as sought (or words to that effect).  <b>SARZ-R4: Recreational activities</b> <b>SARZ-R4A</b> <b>Activity Status:</b> Permitted <b>Where:</b> <b>1. The activity complies with all of the standards.</b> Note: Refer to SARZ-R6 for activities within the Park Island Development Area  <b>SARZ-R4B</b> Matters of restriction are: 1. The matters of discretion stated for infringing the relevant standard(s) being infringed.	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Rules Table /SARZ-R5: Vehicle parking areasSARZ-R5A  Activity Status: Permitted  Where:  Where the car parking area is at-grade: A 2-metre-wide landscaping strip comprised of indigenous plants is provided along the full frontage of the road (except for the vehicle crossing), and One (1) indigenous specimen tree is provided for every ten car parks. SARZ-R5B  Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: Restricted Discretionary  Matters of discretion are:  Neighbourhood and open space character; Efficient use of the site for sport and active recreation activities, and Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces. Notification status: Any application under this rule is precluded from being notified on a public or	Amelia Longley	222.80	Oppose	Vehicle parking areas are an ancillary activity and therefore fall within the definition of 'recreation activity' and 'community facilities'. In addition, Council is the manager of these spaces and any new vehicle parking areas will be subject to the provisions of a Reserve Management Plan. It is not appropriate or necessary for the District Plan to control these activities.	Delete SARZ-R5.	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Rules Table /SARZ-R6: Activities in the Park Island development area	Amelia Longley	222.81	Amend	Agree with the proposed rule but Park Island Development Area should be included on the Planning Maps.	Amend to identify Park Island Development Area on the Planning Maps.	Open Submission

# SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Rules Table /SARZ-R7: Commercial activities	Amelia Longley	222.83	Amend	This rule could mean that temporary food & drink trucks associated with say Saturday morning sport, or an event on the park, may need a controlled activity consent to operate in the SARZ Zone. It would be helpful to permit these types of activity.	Amend rule and or definition of recreational activity to provide for ltd commercial activities ancillary to a sport or recreation event or words to that effect.  <b>SARZ-R7: Commercial activities</b> <b>SARZ-R7A</b> <b>Activity Status:</b> Controlled <b>Where:</b> 1. The activity is for the sale of food and drink and is ancillary to a recreational activity. 2. <b><u>The activity does not involve any temporary food truck associated with a permitted sport or recreation event.</u></b>  <b>Matters of control are:</b> 1. The layout and design of vehicle parking, access, and manouevring areas, and The design and appearance of the building(s).  SARZ-R7B <b>Activity Status where condition 1 is are not met:</b> Discretionary <b><u>Activity Status where activity condition 2 is met: Permitted</u></b>	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Rules Table /SARZ-R8: Activities infringing standards	Amelia Longley	222.84	Amend	This rule should only apply to permitted activities otherwise potentially could end up with a discretionary or non-complying activity that infringes standards being considered under this rule. Clarification of wording to assist in clearer interpretation of the Plan.	Amend as sought or words to that effect.  <b>SARZ-R8: Activities infringing standards</b> <b>SARZ-R8A</b> <b>Activity Status:</b> Restricted Discretionary <b>Matters of restriction are:</b> 1. The matters of discretion stated for <del>infringing</del> the relevant standard(s) <b><u>being infringed.</u></b>	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Rules Table /SARZ-R9: Community activitiesActivity Status: Discretionary NA	Amelia Longley	222.85	Amend	Activity status for the Sport and Active Recreation Zone seems very restrictive for community facilities. Community facilities will also be controlled by the relevant reserves management plan and it is important to enable these activities on public open spaces.	<b>SARZ-R9: Community facility activities</b> <b>SARZ-R9A</b> <b>Activity Status:</b> Discretionary Permitted <b>Where:</b> <b><u>1. The activity complies with all of the standards.</u></b> <b><u>Note: Refer to SARZ-R6 for activities within the Park Island Development Area</u></b>  Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: Restricted Discretionary <b>Matters of restriction are:</b> 1. The matters of discretion stated for <del>infringing</del> the relevant standard(s) are being infringed.	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Rules Table /SARZ-R10: Residential activitiesS	Amelia Longley	222.86	Oppose	The requirement for managers to live onsite is generally no longer required on Council reserves and therefore it is not necessary to have a separate rule for this type of activity. The default Rule NOSZ-R11 is appropriate to cover instances where a Residential activity might be considered. Prohibited activity status is unnecessarily restrictive. The provisions of the Reserves Act 1977, and any relevant RMP would also apply.	Delete SARZ-R10.	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Rules Table /SARZ-R11: Industrial activities	Amelia Longley	222.87	Oppose	There is no justification for 'Prohibited activity' status for activities in the Open Space zones and there may be some instance where you would want to permit industrial activities across a reserve e.g. pipes ancillary to an industrial activity. The default rule SARZ-R12 Non-complying activity status is appropriate to provide for any such applications on SARZ sites.	Delete SARZ-R11A.	Open Submission

# SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Rules Table	Amelia Longley	222.88	Amend	Support non-complying status for activities not otherwise provided for. Minor editing to reference the correct rules.	<p><b>SARZ-R12: Activities not otherwise provided for</b>  <b>SARZ-R12A</b>  <b>Activity Status:</b> Non-complying  <b>Where:</b>                      1. The activity is not provided for under Rules <del>OSZ-R1-OSZ-R11</del> <u>SARZ-R1-SARZ-R11</u></p> <p><b>SARZ-12B</b>                      N/A</p>	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Rules Table	Amelia Longley	222.89	Amend	Council has a large number of reserves whose primary purpose is to provide for stormwater overflow and drainage activities. It is important that these activities are enabled in the Open Space zones. It is not clear whether such activities are provided for as network utilities or not. If not, it would be appropriate to define these works (refer proposed definition) and have an associated enabling rule in the open space zones.	<p>Clarify if the PDP provides for these types of activities elsewhere (eg in the Network Utilities chapter) and if not insert new rule as sought, (or words to that effect).</p> <p><b>SARZ-Rxxx: Stormwater and drainage activities</b>  <b>STADZ-RxxA</b>  <b>Activity Status:</b> Permitted  <b>Where:</b>                      1. <u>The purpose of the activity supports the function and maintenance of Council owned reserves; and</u>                      2. <u>The drainage activities are undertaken by Council (or its contractors)</u>                      -  <b>STADZ-Rxx</b>  <b>Non-complying</b></p>	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Rules Table	Amelia Longley	222.90	Amend	Insert new rule as outlined (or words to that effect). The purpose of this rule is to allow for reserve maintenance activities and buildings associated with them to take place within this zone. A definition of 'reserves maintenance activities' is also proposed.	<p><b>SARZ-Rxxx: Reserves maintenance activities</b>  <b>SARZ-Rxx Reserve maintenance activities</b>  <b>Activity Status:</b> Permitted  <b>Where:</b>                      1. <u>The purpose of the activity supports the function and maintenance of Council owned reserves; and</u>                      2. <u>The drainage activities are undertaken by Council (or its contractors)</u>  <b>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met:</b> Non-complying.</p>	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Standards Table	Amelia Longley	222.91	Amend	Currently there is no link between the rules and standards.	<p>Insert a condition in each rule                      OR Amend to insert a note as sought;                      AND apply in a consistent manner across all Open Space Zones</p> <p><u>All activities must comply with all of the following permitted activity standards set out below:</u></p>	Open Submission

# SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Standards Table /SARZ-S1: Height.	Amelia Longley	222.92	Amend	Clarify wording and intention of standard with respect to residential amenity.	<p>Amend as sought (or words to that effect)</p> <p><b>SARZ-S1: Height</b>  <i>Purpose: to complement the character of the neighbourhood while facilitating appropriate activities; minimise effects on the quality of <u>residential amenity</u> for the neighbours' living environment; provide for support structures in order to allow for the lighting of sports fields .</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Buildings and structures must not exceed 15 m in height.</li> <li>Aerials, lines, and support structures (excluding for lighting) must not exceed 20 m in height.</li> </ol> <p><b>Activity Status where standards are not met:</b> Restricted Discretionary  <b>Matters of discretion are:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Purpose of the standard;</li> <li>Neighbourhood and open space character;</li> <li>Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces, and</li> <li>Quality living amenity environments for adjacent residents.</li> </ol>	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Standards Table /SARZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary	Amelia Longley	222.93	Amend	Minor amendment to purpose and matter of discretion matter (d) referencing environment. Clarify wording and intention of standard with respect to residential amenity.	<p><b>SARZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary</b>  <i>Purpose: to complement the character of the neighbourhood while facilitating appropriate activities; maintain a reasonable level of sunlight access; and minimise effects on the quality of the <u>adjacent residential amenity</u> neighbours' living environment.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Buildings must not project beyond a 45 degree recession plane measured from a point 3 m vertically above ground.</li> </ol> <p><b>Figure 1 - Height in relation to boundary</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where the site abuts an entrance strip or access lot, the furthest boundary of the entrance strip or access lot may be deemed to be the site boundary for the purpose of the standard.</li> </ol> <p><b>Activity Status where standards are not met:</b> Restricted Discretionary  <b>Matters of discretion are:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Purpose of the standard;</li> <li>Neighbourhood and open space character;</li> <li>Safety, attractiveness and connectivity of streets and public open spaces, and</li> <li>Quality living amenity environments for adjacent residents.</li> </ol>	Open Submission

# SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Standards Table /SARZ-S3: Yards	Amelia Longley	222.94	Amend	Minor amendment to purpose and matter of discretion matter (4) referencing environment. Clarify wording and intention of standard with respect to residential amenity.	<p><b>SARZ-S3: Yards</b>  <b>Purpose:</b> to complement the character of the neighbourhood while facilitating appropriate activities; to provide for building maintenance; to provide for a safe and attractive streetscape; to maintain water quality; and provide access to watercourses or open drains for maintenance purposes.</p> <p>1. Any part of a building (including eaves and guttering) must not be erected closer than 6 m to any site boundary.                  2. Any building, fence, permanently fixed structure or part thereof must not be erected closer than 6 m from the top of the bank of any watercourse, open drain, identified stormwater detention area and/or overland flow path.</p> <p><b>Activity Status where standards are not met:</b> Restricted Discretionary  <b>Matters of discretion are:</b>                  1. Purpose of the standard;                  2. Neighbourhood and open space character;                  3. Safety, attractiveness and connectivity of streets and public open spaces, and                  4. Quality <del>living</del> <b>amenity</b> environments for <b>adjacent residents</b>.</p>	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Standards Table /SARZ-S4: Gross floor area	Amelia Longley	222.95	Amend	Uncertain as to where Park Island Control Area is located. Minor amendment to clarify purpose and matter of discretion matter (4) referencing 'living' environment.	<p>Make minor amendments as sought and define extent of 'Park Island Control Area' on planning maps.</p> <p>SARZ-S4: Gross floor area</p> <p><i>All sport and active recreation zoned sites except for the Park Island Control Area.</i>  <b>Purpose:</b> to maintain open space for sport and active recreation activities</p> <p>1. The maximum gross floor area of buildings on a site must not exceed 500 m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area.                  2. The combined maximum gross floor area of buildings within each sports hub, as identified on the Park Island Master Plan, must not exceed 4,000 m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area, provided that:</p> <p><i>Park Island Control Area.</i>  <b>Purpose:</b> to facilitate efficient use of Park Island in accordance with the Park Island Master Plan.</p> <p>1. No one building must exceed 2,000 m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area, and                  2. Buildings exceeding 500 m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area must be located no less than 30 m apart.</p> <p><b>Activity Status where standards are not met:</b> Restricted Discretionary  <b>Matters of discretion are:</b>                  1. Purpose of the standard;                  2. Neighbourhood and open space character;</p>	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Standards Table /SARZ-S5: Fences and walls	Amelia Longley	222.96	Amend	Clarify how these rules will work with fencing requirements in the Residential Zone and achieve consistent fencing around the perimeter of public open spaces. This rule could result in undesirable outcomes for open space. Consistent fencing, providing for visual surveillance around the park boundaries, is desirable.	Delete or amend to clarify.	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /Assessment criteria	Amelia Longley	222.97	Amend	The activity status of an activity determines whether regard should be had to objectives and policies of this plan and not appropriate to have this note here.	Amend as sought When considering an application the Council will have regard to <del>the relevant objectives and policies of this plan, the purpose of the rules and standards, and regard will also be had to the relevant assessment criteria set out below:</del>	Open Submission

# SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /Assessment criteria /SARZ-AC1: New buildings not meeting permitted conditions (SARZ-R1); Additions, alterations, maintenance, and repair to existing buildings not meeting permitted conditions (SARZ-R3); Relocated buildings (SARZ-R2)	Amelia Longley	222.98	Amend	Consequential amendment supporting submission on Rule SARZ-R1 and SARZ-R3, and minor amendment referencing 'open space' environment instead of 'living' environment. As some land within the sport and active recreation zone is forms part of Councils stormwater capacity it would also be appropriate to include assessment criteria relating to infrastructure management and stormwater design.	<b>SARZ-AC1: New buildings not meeting permitted conditions (SARZ-R1); Additions, alterations, maintenance, and repair to existing buildings not meeting permitted conditions (SARZ-R3); Relocated buildings (SARZ-R2)</b> <i>Neighbourhood and open space character</i> a. The extent to which the character of the neighbourhood and the park or reserve is maintained by the proposed building. This includes consideration of: i. any positive defining characteristics of the neighbourhood, and ii. any values identified in an approved reserve management plan. b. Whether parking, storage areas, and buildings are adequately screened from adjoining sites or public places and roads by fencing and/or landscaping. c. Whether proposed landscaping is compatible with the landscape character of the surrounding environment.  <i>Efficient use of the site for sport and active recreation activities</i> d. Whether the scale and/or location of the building will compromise the efficient use and development of the park or reserve for sport and active recreation activities.  <i>Safety, attractiveness and connectivity of streets and public open spaces</i>	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /Assessment criteria /SARZ-AC2: Vehicle parking areas not meeting permitted conditions (SARZ-R5)	Amelia Longley	222.99	Oppose	As some land within the sport and active recreation zone is forms part of Councils stormwater capacity it would also be appropriate to include assessment criteria relating to infrastructure management and stormwater design. For the same reasons as set out with respect to Rule SARZ-R5 above, delete these provisions	Delete SARZ-AC2.	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /Assessment criteria /SARZ-AC3: Commercial activities (SARZ-R7); Community activities (SARZ-R9); Residential activities (SARZ-R10)The criteria below will be considered in addition to the relevant objectives and policies of the plan. Neighbourhood and open space character The extent to which the character of the neighbourhood and the park or reserve is maintained by the proposed activity. This includes consideration of: any positive defining characteristics of the neighbourhood, and any values identified in an approved reserve management plan. Efficient use of the site for sport and active recreation activities Whether the scale and/or location of the activity will compromise the efficient use and development of the park or reserve for sport and active recreation activities. Contribution to community wellbeing The extent to which locating the activity in the Sport and Active Recreation Zone will contribute to the wellbeing of the local community. Whether that contribution could be achieved by locating the activity in a zone other than the Sport and Active Recreation Zone. Safety, attractiveness and connectivity of streets and public open spaces	Amelia Longley	222.100	Amend	Consequential amendment to reflect submission on Rules SARZ-R7, SARZ-R9 and SARZ-R10	<del>SARZ-AC3: Commercial activities (SARZ-R7); Community facility activities (SARZ-R9); Residential activities (SARZ-R10)</del> The criteria below will be considered in addition to the relevant objectives and policies of the plan. Neighbourhood and open space character a. The extent to which the character of the neighbourhood and the park or reserve is maintained by the proposed activity. This includes consideration of: i. any positive defining characteristics of the neighbourhood, and ii. any values identified in an approved reserve management plan.  Efficient use of the site for sport and active recreation activities b. Whether the scale and/or location of the activity will compromise the efficient use and development of the park or reserve for sport and active recreation activities. Contribution to community wellbeing c. The extent to which locating the activity in the Sport and Active Recreation Zone will contribute to the wellbeing of the local community. d. Whether that contribution could be achieved by locating the activity in a zone other than the Sport and Active Recreation Zone.  Safety, attractiveness and connectivity of streets and public open spaces	Open Submission

# SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Rules Table /SARZ-R2: Relocated buildings	Sean Thompson	225.18	Amend	Considers that it is not self-evident from the analysis and rationale in the PDP, including in terms of s 32 RMA, why relocated buildings should be classified as non-complying in the NCZ, LCZ, LFRZ, LIZ and GIZ. It is accepted that relocated buildings should be discretionary in the Natural Open Space Zone, and there may be urban design and other considerations applicable to the Town Centre Zone and City Centre Zone which warrant different treatment. Since a 2004 Central Otago Environment Court decision most local authorities in New Zealand have either adopted permitted activity classification for relocated buildings (with no standards) or provided for permitted activity status with prescribed performance standards.	Seeks to amend the SARZ Rule as follows: b. For the relocated building rules in all zones (including SARZ), the removal of the requirement to deposit a monitoring fee at the same time as submitting the relocated building report; c. Amending the performance standards in relation to relocated buildings in accordance with the wording in the attached Schedule 1 (which can be found in the attached submission), to provide for: i. modification of the performance timeframes such that relocation on permanent foundation is required within two months, and twelve months is allowed for the completion of all reinstatement works; ii. provision for a pre-inspection report in the same or similar form as found in Schedule 2 (which can be found in the attached submission).Consequential or further relief including to the relevant objectives, policies and provisions of the proposed plan in order to give effect to relief sought. (The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Rules Table /SARZ-R12	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.150	Oppose	Notes there is no provision for infrastructure in SARZ-R1-SARZ-R11, leading this activity falling into a non-complying activity status in accordance with SARZ-R12. Notes sections of the SH designation fall within or adjoin Natural Open Space zoning and notes the non-complying activity status would set an overly restrictive activity status for the development, maintenance and operation of the SH transport network. Seeks amendments in the form of a new rule to provide for the maintenance and operation of infrastructure within the Natural Open Space Zone.	Add a new rule setting a restricted discretionary activity status for the maintenance, repair and operation of existing infrastructure.	Open Submission
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Rules Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.75	Amend	Fire and Emergency requires the ability to construct and operate emergency service facilities (i.e., fire stations) in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies. This means new fire stations may be necessary in any zone across the district in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations.Fire and Emergency notes that the effects of a fire station can be largely anticipated and, in the most part, do not differ to the effects of many activities that may be anticipated through rural and urban environments.Fire and Emergency requests that emergency service facilities are provided for as permitted activities in the larger, more extensive zones of the district to recognise the critical importance of emergency services to communities. In providing for emergency service facility as a permitted activity would mean that emergency service facilities would be controlled by the subsequent performance standards of each zone (such as height, height in relation to boundary, front yards, building coverage requirements).and the other relevant performance standards in other chapters (i.e., transport) to ensure that any effects are appropriately managed.	Seeks to include new permitted activity as follows: <b>xxx-Rx: Emergency service facilities</b> <b>Activity Status:</b> Permitted - N/A  Or  To similar effect.  And  any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.	Open Submission



# SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone /SARZ - Sport and Active Recreation Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.94	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency’s main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</p> <p>SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB-S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.</p> <p>In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and</p>	<p><b>To include a new performance standard as follows:</b>  <u>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</u>            1. All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.            2. Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.  <u>Matter of discretion:</u>            1. The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.</p>	Open Submission

# AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone	Wayne Ormsby	63.4	Support	Support the creation of the Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology Zone and the establishment of the Ahuriri Regional Park. Suggest social procurement of taiao teams for planting and biodiversity management, the establishment of flounder nurseries, and the managed release of taonga species.	Support the Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology Zone chapter.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone	Catherine Hawkins	148.1	Amend	We agree with the Regional Park concept as long as it is a last resort and not a first resort to deal with removing/reducing/cleaning contaminants which are discharged into the Ahuriri Estuary.	Support Ahuriri Regional Park provided efforts to remove/eliminate contaminants are made throughout the network prior to stormwater reaching the estuary. More funding/research needed in order for the Council to come up with the best way(s) to deal with the issue of eliminating/reducing the amount of contaminants being discharged into the Ahuriri Estuary.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Issues /AESZ-12: The Ahuriri estuary, and its margins is home to significant indigenous species and habitats that are under threat from human activity.	Angie Denby	149.3	Amend	Ahuriri Regional Park is proposed on the southern boundary of the Ahuriri Estuary. The remaining estuary is constantly under threat from human intervention including sediment, nutrients and toxins; invasive tubeworm; and the intermittent release of wastewater. The Ahuriri Protection Society wants assurance that the Ahuriri Regional Park considers and addresses the following matters: any release or spill of toxins/sediment into the estuary; impacts on tidal flow from disruption to stopbanks; noise and light spill; management of building setbacks; disturbance from recreational activities; stormwater quality management; involvement of experts. In addition, Ahuriri Protection Society would like to see:  - Quicker timelines for following the recommendations from the NCC 3-year waterway monitoring programme for Stormwater upgrading. - Increased staffing and resources to follow through on Environmental Plans required of all business and industry to remove the danger of spills into the estuary. - Invest in 'on the spot' successful treatment solutions at toxic 'hot spots' in the waterways	The Ahuriri Protection Society wants assurance that the Ahuriri Regional Park considers and addresses the following matters: any release or spill of toxins/sediment into the estuary; impacts on tidal flow from disruption to stopbanks; noise and light spill; management of building setbacks; disturbance from recreational activities; stormwater quality management; involvement of experts.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.1	Amend	Considers that the land within the Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (Ahuriri Estuary) Stormwater and Ecology Special Zone (AESZ) is proposed to be established as a regional park. As the project develops, the Joint Committee will agree on a name for the ARP. For clarity in implementation, it is appropriate that the name of the Special Zone reflects the agreed name for the ARP.	Amend through renaming the Special Zone to reflect the name for the Ahuriri Regional Park to be determined by the Joint Committee prior to District Plan hearings commencing.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Objectives	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.2	Support	Considers in general terms, the objectives of the Special Zone reflect the aspirations of the Joint Committee while recognising the location of the Site in close proximity to the Airport. The potential tensions between these key objectives can be resolved through the master planning process.	Retain the objectives for the zone subject to amendments sought in other submission points.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Objectives /AESZ-O1: Open space and stormwater function.	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.3	Amend	Considers that Objective O1 as currently drafted refers to stormwater retention and treatment. Retention differs from detention as detention is only temporarily holding back water and letting it slowly release into the receiving environment, whereas retention is long term retention of the water on the site. For clarity, an amendment to the wording is recommended to clarify the intention to accommodate detention.	Amend AESZ-O1 as follows: The zone functions as an open space while providing stormwater <u>detention</u> , retention and treatment.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Objectives /AESZ-O3: Cultural associations, values and practices.  Relates to AESZ-I4	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.4	Amend	Objective 3 recognises that cultural practices would be appropriate but only where they don't conflict with the objectives of stormwater management, habitat restoration, and water quality improvements. Removing the "qualifier" from the objective would place it in the first equal priority category alongside the other objectives, and tensions can be resolved alongside the other objectives as part of the masterplanning process.	Amend AESZ-O3 as follows: Cultural associations and values with water, land, and habitats are improved and protected, and cultural practices are enabled <del>where these are compatible with stormwater management, habitat restoration, and water quality improvements.</del>	Open Submission

# AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Objectives /AESZ-O5: Recreational, community, and commercial land uses.  Relates to AESZ-I1, AESZ-I2, AESZ-I4, and AESZ-I5	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.5	Amend	Small scale educational facilities are enabled through the rules of the zone and may be appropriate e.g. to support community education around ecological and cultural values of the Site. However, this isn't clearly captured under the definition of "community facilities" therefore should be added to this objective for clarity of intent.	Amend AESZ-O5 as follows:  AESZ-O5: Recreational, community, <u>educational</u> and commercial land uses  Recreational, community, <u>educational</u> and commercial activities avoid adverse effects on the stormwater management and ecological and cultural restoration functions of the zone.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Policies /AESZ-P1: Activities enabled.	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.6	Amend	Considers stormwater detention should be included alongside retention in this policy to give effect to amended AESZ-O1.	Amend AESZ-P1 as follows:  Enable passive recreation, stormwater retention <u>and detention</u> , and treatment of stormwater.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Rules Table /AESZ-R3: Activities associated with stormwater collection, retention, treatment, and disposal.	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.7	Amend	Considers that this permitted activity rule gives effect to the relevant objective and policy and therefore is supported by the Joint Committee. However, the heading should be amended to include stormwater detention to give effect to amended AESZ-P1.	Amend the heading of Rule AESZ-R3 as follows:  Activities associated with stormwater collection, <u>detention</u> , retention, treatment, and disposal.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Standards Table /AESZ-S9: Stormwater retention and treatment facilities.	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.8	Oppose	Considers the requirement for stormwater treatment be in accordance with an approved stormwater discharge consent is unnecessary, as the regional plan requirements apply in addition in any case. Having a prohibited status to infringe this standard could affect the programme of the project e.g. where resource consent is sought for earthworks associated with forming stormwater detention areas and/or treatment wetlands prior to a stormwater discharge consent being approved. We therefore seeking that this standard be removed.	Delete Standard AESZ-S9.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Policies /AESZ-P2: Habitat restoration.	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.9	Amend	Considers the current wording of Policy AESZ-P2 elevates the stormwater management function of the zone above habitat restoration. This does not directly give effect to the objectives. The Joint Committee will work through these tensions between objectives as part of the master planning process rather than having this pre-determined in the District Plan.	Amend AESZ-P2 as follows:  AESZ-P2: Habitat restoration: Enable the restoration and creation of indigenous habitats <del>where this does not compromise the stormwater management function of this zone.</del>	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Policies /AESZ-P3: Protecting ecological values.  Relates to AESZ-O2, AESZ-O3, AESZ-O4, AESZ-O5, and AESZ-O7	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.10	Amend	Policy AESZ-P3 regarding the protection of ecological values utilises the term "avoid" which is very directive and may not always be completely achievable for all four sub-matters. An effects hierarchy approach could be adopted instead i.e. "Avoid to the extent practicable, and otherwise remedy or mitigate adverse effects". This is generally consistent with the approach taken in the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity.	Amend AESZ-P3 as follows:  AESZ-P3: Protecting ecological values: Avoid <u>to the extent practicable, and otherwise remedy or mitigate</u> adverse effects on habitats and ecological values associated with:  a) watercourses and their margins; b) the estuary, the coastal marine area, and their margins; c) Indigenous and migratory species, and d) public reserves and recreational areas on adjacent land.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Policies /AESZ-P4: Enhancement of cultural values.  Relates to AESZ-O3, AESZ-O4, AESZ-O5, and AESZ-O7	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.11	Amend	Policy AESZ-P4 gives effect to the corresponding objective, however, having the enhancement of cultural values be subject to the stormwater management purpose of the zone places it instead in a second tier of priority. For these values and functions to sit alongside each other the Joint Committee seeks deletion of the "conflict" clause of the policy. Tensions between objectives for the Site will be resolved by the Joint Committee through the masterplanning process.	Amend AESZ-P4 as follows:  AESZ-P4: Enhancement of cultural values: Protect and restore cultural values through the restoration of habitats and ecosystems and enhance cultural values through providing for and celebrating cultural associations of mana whenua with the site and enabling traditional cultural practices <del>where this does not conflict with the stormwater management purpose of this zone.</del>	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Rules Table /AESZ-R5: Māori purpose activities.	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.12	Support	Considers this rule enables both long term and temporary activities associated with Māori purposes from occurring on the site. At this stage, it has not been determined whether any area of the regional park would be set aside for events such as tangihanga, however, this could be managed through the masterplan and management of the park, rather than relying on District Plan standards. In this context, the permitted activity rule is appropriate and gives effect to the policy direction.	Retain Rule AESZ-R5.	Open Submission

# AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Policies /AESZ-P5: Rural land uses Enable rural land use where these activities do not impact on the ability for the zone to fulfil its stormwater management function. Relates to AESZ-O1	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.13	Oppose	Considers that to ensure the objectives of the zone are achieved, we suggest that the policy for rural land uses is deleted (there is no directly supporting objective). Existing grazing activities can be provided for through existing use rights and an appropriate permitted activity rule.	Delete Policy AESZ-P5	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Rules Table /AESZ-R7: Primary production activities.	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.14	Amend	Ongoing rural production of the land is considered appropriate until development of the Ahuriri Regional Park. Ongoing passive grazing may continue under existing use rights or as secured through the permitted activity. There are no standards, however, associated with the activity. To ensure the objectives of the zone are achieved, the permitted activity rule should be restricted to grazing of livestock, rather than primary production more generally which incorporates the above listed activities.	Amend AESZ-R7 to refer to "Grazing of livestock" instead of "Primary Production".	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Rules Table /AESZ-R4: Recreational activities	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.16	Amend	Neither passive recreation (Policy AESZ-P1) or informal recreation (AESZ-R4A) are defined terms in the PDP. We suggest a definition be added and "passive recreation" rather than "informal recreation" used across both the policy and rule. In principle, this activity is anticipated for the regional park and therefore this approach is supported. Other recreational activities would require resource consent and be assessed against the objectives and policies for the zone.	Amend AESZ-R4A to refer to "passive recreation" rather than "informal recreation".	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Rules Table /AESZ-R6: Community facilities.	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.17	Amend	Community facility means land and buildings used by members of the community for recreational, sporting, cultural, safety, health, welfare, or worship purposes. It includes provision for any ancillary activity that assists with the operation of the community facility. The range of community facilities provided is consistent with the intended regional park use of the zone, including education and research activities directly related to the open space. Buildings larger than 80sqm would trigger a resource consent assessment. Appropriate siting and design of any buildings can be considered through the masterplanning process. To give effect to the objective and policy changes above, we suggest that the rule for community facilities explicitly be extended to educational facilities.	Amend the heading of AESZ-R6 to refer to Community facilities <u>and educational facilities</u> .	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Policies /AESZ-P6: Recreational, community, and commercial land uses. Relates to AESZ-O1, AESZ-O2, AESZ-O3, AESZ-O4, and AESZ-O5	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.18	Amend	This policy gives effect to the corresponding objective. Educational activities should be explicitly provided for alongside community and other land uses.	Amend AESZ-P6 as follows:  Recreational, community, <u>educational</u> and commercial land uses: Enable small-scale and ancillary recreational, community, <u>educational</u> and/or commercial activities where they do not adversely affect the stormwater management and ecological and cultural restoration functions of the zone.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Rules Table /AESZ-R8: Commercial activities associated with the sale of food and drink.	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.19	Support	This rule enables commercial activities associated with the sale of food and drink as a restricted discretionary activity, which gives effect to AESZ-P6.	Retain AESZ-R8	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Policies /AESZ-P7: Other land uses. Relates to AESZ-O2; AESZ-O3, AESZ-O4, AESZ-O6, and AESZ-O7	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.20	Support	The general avoidance of residential and industrial activities in the zone is appropriate to give effect to the objectives.	Retain AESZ-P7	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Rules Table /AESZ-R11: Residential and industrial activities.	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.21	Amend	Although avoiding residential and industrial activities will generally be appropriate, there may be limited situations where they are appropriate such as small scale manufacturing of natural products. A prohibited activity status would not allow resource consent to be sought for those activities. A non-complying activity status still gives effect to the policy direction but would allow a potentially appropriate activity to be assessed on its merits against the objectives and policies for the zone as a whole.	Amend AESZ-R11 to make residential and industrial activities Non-complying rather than Prohibited.	Open Submission

# AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Rules Table /AESZ-R10: Activities not otherwise provided for.	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.22	Amend	Other activities not specifically listed in the activity table, such as commercial activities not otherwise provided for, should be non-complying rather than discretionary. Access to the Taipo Stream and Ahuriri Estuary may not be appropriate in all circumstances and where it is appropriate, should not be tied to an activity status for other activities not specifically anticipated in the zone.	Amend AESZ-R10A to change status from Discretionary to Non-Complying and remove the activity standards.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Policies /AESZ-P8: Safe and efficient operation of Hawke's Bay Airport.  Relates to AESZ-O6 and AESZ-O7	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.23	Support	There are no specific activity rules for airport related activities. This policy supports the height limit standard, and would also be a relevant consideration for the assessment of any resource consent application in the zone. This is considered to be appropriate and is a matter that will be considered by the Joint Committee in developing the masterplan for the Site.	Retain AESZ-P8.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Policies /AESZ-P9: Natural hazards and climate change.  Relates to AESZ-O2 and AESZ-O7	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.24	Support	There are no specific activity rules for natural hazards and climate change. This policy supports the avoidance of residential activities in the zone, and would also be a relevant consideration for the assessment of any resource consent application in the zone. This is considered to be appropriate.	Retain AESZ-P9.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Standards Table /AESZ-S1: Development setback.	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.25	Support	The development setback standard gives effect to the policy direction for the zone.	Retain AESZ-S1.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Standards Table /AESZ-S2: Yards.	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.26	Support	The yards setback standard gives effect to the policy direction for the zone.	Retain AESZ-S2.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Standards Table /AESZ-S3: Height.	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.27	Support	The height standard gives effect to the policy direction for the zone.	Retain AESZ-S3.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Standards Table /AESZ-S4: Height in relation to boundary.	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.28	Support	The height in relation to boundary standard gives effect to the policy direction for the zone.	Retain AESZ-S4.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Standards Table /AESZ-S5: Building materials and roof surfaces.	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.29	Support	The building materials and roof surfaces standard gives effect to the policy direction for the zone.	Retain AESZ-S5.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Standards Table /AESZ-S6: Landscaped area.	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.30	Support	The landscaped area standard gives effect to the policy direction for the zone.	Retain AESZ-S6.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Standards Table /AESZ-S8: Building coverage.	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.31	Oppose	The total building coverage rule of 1000m <sup>2</sup> is intended to capture potential cumulative effects. However, it is largely arbitrary for a site of this size. The visual amenity and other effects associated with buildings will depend more on the scale of each building, and the placement within the site and landscape. It is noted buildings are also managed under the landscape overlay. This standard is therefore not required to achieve the objectives for the zone.	Delete AESZ-S8.	Open Submission

# AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Objectives /AESZ-O1: Open space and stormwater function. Relates to AESZ-I1	Susan Elaine Macdonald	178.3	Amend	Despite proposed upgrades of stormwater, submitter has concerns that stormwater runoff from extra housing will overload stormwater infrastructure. Notes that 70% of Napier's stormwater runs into Ahuriri Estuary, housing infill will increase this. Regarding proposed new regional park concept at blue lagoon farm that will provide treatment, what does this mean? The concept must be the last resort to preventing contaminates within the estuary. More work and funding need to be allocated to preventing contaminants reaching Lagoon Farm.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Policies /AESZ-P7: Other land uses. Relates to AESZ-O2; AESZ-O3, AESZ-O4, AESZ-O6, and AESZ-O7	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	195.2	Oppose	Considers that zone appropriate activities can be determined after the masterplanning process, with a focus on the priority objectives of stormwater management, ecological restoration, enhancement of cultural values and management of natural hazards and effects from climate change. Considers that the policy framework should acknowledge objectives without pre-determining appropriate activities noting that there may opportunity for other activities that do not detract from the overall direction for the Site. Opposes and considers that the "Avoid" policy, predetermines the outcome of this process, is not required to give effect to the zone objectives, and should be deleted.	Delete Policy AESZ-P7	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /General /General	Ellen Robotham	198.107	Oppose	Considers that the thriving birdlife within the estuarine environment creates a challenging environment in which to operate an airport, due to the risk of bird strike and disturbance and other safety issues.  While supporting the development of the Regional Park to the south and its rezoning as proposed in principle, it is important to recognise that the zone is located within the approach and departure paths for the airport and the chapter therefore needs to carefully manage the types of activities that can be established and the potential effects they may generated that impact on the operational needs of the Airport. Key concerns are:  - Activities that may give rise to an increase in bird strike risk (i.e. establishment of waterbodies and the introduction of bird habitats and food sources). - Activities that encourage the congregation of people within Runway End Protection Areas ("REPA"). - The establishment of noise sensitive activities. - The establishment of structures that may penetrate the OLS. the establishment of activities that may mimic operational features at the airport (such as lighting).  HBAL submits that the costs and risks to aircraft operations have not been appropriately evaluated in terms of section 32 of the RMA and that the chapter requires significant rework to ensure the matters raised above are appropriately addressed	Submitter makes a general statement that the chapter needs to be amended to address the issues raised in subsequent submission points. Refer to full submission.	Open Submission

# AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Issues /AESZ-13: The opportunities to restore water quality and habitats, enhance biodiversity, retain and enhance character and amenity values, and provide for stormwater management needs must be balanced with the functional needs of adjacent land uses, including the Hawke's Bay airport.	Ellen Robotham	198.108	Amend	<p>Considers that the thriving birdlife within the estuarine environment creates a challenging environment in which to operate an airport, due to the risk of bird strike and disturbance and other safety issues.</p> <p>While supporting the development of the Regional Park to the south and its rezoning as proposed in principle, it is important to recognise that the zone is located within the approach and departure paths for the airport and the chapter therefore needs to carefully manage the types of activities that can be established and the potential effects they may generated that impact on the operational needs of the Airport. Key concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Activities that may give rise to an increase in bird strike risk (i.e. establishment of waterbodies and the introduction of bird habitats and food sources).</li> <li>- Activities that encourage the congregation of people within Runway End Protection Areas ("REPA").</li> <li>- The establishment of noise sensitive activities.</li> <li>- The establishment of structures that may penetrate the OLS.</li> <li>- The establishment of activities that may mimic operational features at the airport (such as lighting).</li> </ul> <p>HBAL submits that the costs and risks to aircraft operations have not been appropriately evaluated in terms of section 32 of the RMA and that the chapter requires significant rework to ensure the matters raised above are appropriately addressed.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>The opportunities to restore water quality and habitats, enhance biodiversity, retain and enhance character and amenity values, and provide for stormwater management needs <del>must be balanced</del> <u>with not constrain or compromise the functional and operational</u> needs of adjacent land uses, including the Hawke's Bay airport.</p>	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Issues /AESZ-15: The zone is subject to a number of development constraints including public works and designations, natural hazards, and the effects of climate change.	Ellen Robotham	198.109	Oppose	It is appropriate to recognise the development constraints associated with airport operations and functions, however the scope of these constraints is too narrowly defined.	Amend to include those matters identified in HBAL's submission, which include activities that give rise to an increase in the risk of bird strike; the establishment of noise sensitive activities; activities that encourage the congregation of people at the end of the runway; the establishment of structures that may penetrate the OLS; and the establishment of activities that may mimic operational features at the airport (such as lighting).	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Objectives /AESZ-O6: Efficient operation of the Hawke's Bay airport.  Relates to AESZ-I2, AESZ-I3, and AESZ-I5	Ellen Robotham	198.110	Support	It is appropriate to recognise the development constraints associated with airport operations and functions.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Policies /AESZ-P8: Safe and efficient operation of Hawke's Bay Airport.  Relates to AESZ-O6 and AESZ-O7	Ellen Robotham	198.111	Support	It is appropriate to recognise the development constraints associated with airport operations and functions.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Standards Table /AESZ-S3: Height.	Ellen Robotham	198.112	Amend	It is appropriate to recognise the development constraints imposed by HBAL's designation, however it should also refer to vegetation.	Amend to include reference to vegetation.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Assessment criteria /AESZ-AC1: All infringements to standards (AESZ-S1 - AESZ-S9).	Ellen Robotham	198.113	Amend	It is appropriate to recognise the development constraints associated with airport operations and functions, however the scope of the assessment matters is too narrow to address the matter raised in the full submission, which include activities that give rise to an increase in the risk of bird strike; the establishment of noise sensitive activities; activities that encourage the congregation of people at the end of the runway; the establishment of structures that may penetrate the OLS; and the establishment of activities that may mimic operational features at the airport (such as lighting).	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

# AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Objectives /AESZ-O4: Natural character and amenity. enhanced.  Relates to AESZ-I3	denise fastier	245.5	Support	Supports objective but considers the water quality in the estuary needs improvement	Seeks cleaning up the water quality in the estuary. No specific relief sought	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Objectives /AESZ-O2: Protection and enhancement of ecological values.  Relates to AESZ-I2 and AESZ-I3	denise fastier	245.6	Support	Supports objective but considers that the water quality in the estuary needs improvement	Seeks cleaning up the water quality in the estuary. No specific relief sought	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Issues /AESZ-I2: The Ahuriri estuary, and its margins is home to significant indigenous species and habitats that are under threat from human activity.	denise fastier	245.7	Support	Supports objective but considers that the water quality in the estuary needs improvement	Seeks cleaning up the water quality in the estuary. No specific relief sought	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Issues /AESZ-I3: The opportunities to restore water quality and habitats, enhance biodiversity, retain and enhance character and amenity values, and provide for stormwater management needs must be balanced with the functional needs of adjacent land uses, including the Hawke's Bay airport.	denise fastier	245.8	Support	Supports objective but considers that the water quality in the estuary needs improvement	Seeks cleaning up the water quality in the estuary. No specific relief sought	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Rules Table /AESZ-R4: Recreational activities.	denise fastier	245.9	Support	Supports rule but considers that recreational activities need to fit in with the environment. Seeks restriction on big crowds and sporting events where sensitive wildlife are trying to net and feed as there are other appropriate location for those activities	Seeks restriction on big crowds and sporting events where sensitive wildlife are trying to net and feed as there are other appropriate location for those activities. No specific relief sought	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Objectives /AESZ-O2: Protection and enhancement of ecological values.  Relates to AESZ-I2 and AESZ-I3	Trevor Ellis	253.87	Support	AESZ-O2 gives effect to the NPS-FM, NPS-IB and the Act.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Objectives /AESZ-O4: Natural character and amenity.  Relates to AESZ-I3	Trevor Ellis	253.88	Support	AESZ-O4 gives effect to the NPS-FM, NPS-IB and the Act.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Objectives /AESZ-O5: Recreational, community, and commercial land uses.  Relates to AESZ-I1, AESZ-I2, AESZ-I4, and AESZ-I5	Trevor Ellis	253.89	Support	AESZ-O5 recognises the importance of ecological and cultural restoration functions of the zone above other functions and thus gives effect to the hierarchy as laid out in the NPS-FM.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Policies /AESZ-P2: Habitat restoration.  Relates to AESZ-O2, AESZ-O3, and AESZ-O4	Trevor Ellis	253.90	Amend	Considers that the objective title and content do not match. The title implies that there is the protection and enhancement of ecological values, but the objective is written to only provide the ecological values protection and not enhancement.  The objective content should be amended to reflect the objective title, which would further implement and give effect to the NZCPS and NPS-IB.	seeks to amend the objective as following: AESZ-O2: Protection and enhancement of ecological values The life-supporting capacity of habitats, are protected and enhanced and ecological values of Te Whanga (the Ahuriri estuary), Tāipo Stream, Napier waterways and their margins are protected <u>and enhanced</u> .	Open Submission



# AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Policies /AESZ-P3: Protecting ecological values. Relates to AESZ-O2, AESZ-O3, AESZ-O4, AESZ-O5, and AESZ-O7	Trevor Ellis	253.91	Support	AESZ-P2 gives effect to the NPS-FM and NPS-IB.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Policies /AESZ-P7: Other land uses. Relates to AESZ-O2; AESZ-O3, AESZ-O4, AESZ-O6, and AESZ-O7	Trevor Ellis	253.92	Support	AESZ-P7 gives effect to the NPS-FM by avoiding adding cumulative adverse effects through residential and housing run off.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Rules Table /AESZ-R1: Planting, plant maintenance, pest and noxious plant control, habitat restoration, and conservation activities.	Trevor Ellis	253.93	Support	AESZ-R1 enables DOC and other conservation groups to carry out conservation work as necessary.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Rules Table /AESZ-R2: Growing and supplying of plants.	Trevor Ellis	253.94	Support	AESZ-R2 enables DOC and other conservation groups to carry out conservation work as necessary.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Standards Table /AESZ-S1: Development setback.	Trevor Ellis	253.95	Support	No buildings within 200m setback from the Estuary provides for water quality protection according to the NPS-FM.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Standards Table /AESZ-S2: Yards.	Trevor Ellis	253.96	Support	200m is a good barrier and/or buffer to provide for future and current restoration of the Estuary and its capabilities to be a stormwater zone.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Assessment criteria /AESZ-AC1: All infringements to standards (AESZ-S1 - AESZ-S9).	Trevor Ellis	253.97	Support	The assessment criteria covering the improvement of ecological values and protection, setback distances, and cumulative effects, gives effect to the Act and the NPS-IB.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Objectives /AESZ-O2: Protection and enhancement of ecological values. Relates to AESZ-I2 and AESZ-I3	Nichola Nicholson	264.16	Support	Supports in principle the proposed approach of stormwater retention and treatment while enabling habitat restoration, cultural enhancement, and passive recreation activities.	No relief sought	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Policies /AESZ-P2: Habitat restoration. Relates to AESZ-O2, AESZ-O3, and AESZ-O4	Nichola Nicholson	264.17	Amend	Seeks that the PDP requires/promotes the creation of indigenous habitat (the use of nature-based solutions) which not only contribute to stormwater management but have multiple benefits (such as biodiversity).	We seek that Amend policy AESZ-P2: Habitat restoration to require/promote nature based solutions.	Open Submission

# AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /General /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.7	Amend	Considers the Ahuriri Estuary is of particular importance as a gazetted Wildlife Reserve. Forest & Bird considers that there needs to be an integrated approach to avoiding, remedying and mitigating adverse effects of activities on the Ahuriri Estuary, extending throughout all relevant provisions of the Napier District Plan.	Seeks that Objectives, policies, rules and standards which recognise and provide for the importance of Ahuriri Estuary and surrounding wetlands to retaining shorebirds in Napier, including the important role of the estuary in supporting biodiversity values of other remaining remnant areas of indigenous biodiversity in the district are included in the PDP.  Seeks that Objectives, policies, rules and standards which recognize the ecological connections between the Ahuriri Estuary and other parts of the district, and that the Ahuriri Estuary can support opportunities for other ecological restoration, including in urban areas, thereby also helping to provide climate change resilience are included in the PDP.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Objectives /AESZ-O2: Protection and enhancement of ecological values. Relates to AESZ-I2 and AESZ-I3	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.185	Amend	Considers this objective should also refer to the need to avoid adverse effects of activities on threatened or at-risk indigenous species.	Amend to: "The life-supporting capacity of habitats are protected and enhanced and ecological values of Te Whanga (the Ahuriri estuary), Tāipo Stream, Napier waterways and their margins are protected, and adverse effects of activities on threatened or at-risk indigenous species are avoided."	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Objectives /AESZ-O4: Natural character and amenity. Relates to AESZ-I3	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.186	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /Policies /AESZ-P3: Protecting ecological values. Relates to AESZ-O2, AESZ-O3, AESZ-O4, AESZ-O5, and AESZ-O7	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.187	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /General /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.188	Oppose	Whole chapter, including Introduction, Objectives, Policies and Rules  Arising from late notification of ECO-chapter	Seeks to add: "The <u>Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity</u> chapter includes provisions which relate to the Ecology and Stormwater Zone. Where there is a conflict between the Ecology and Stormwater Zone chapter and the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter, the provisions that place greater or additional restrictions on activities with adverse effects on the natural environment will apply".	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Rules Table /AESZ-R3: Activities associated with stormwater collection, retention, treatment, and disposal.	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.189	Oppose	Activities associated with stormwater collection, retention, treatment and disposal" are potentially wide- ranging. As submitted below, the proposed standards do not provide an adequate basis for treating these as permitted activities. It will not be possible to apply the assessment criteria set out at AESZ-AC1 where these activities are permitted. Restricted discretionary status would be more appropriate for this class of activities.	Amend activity status to restricted discretionary, and specify appropriate matters of discretion, including those matters currently included at AESZ-AC1 as assessment criteria.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Standards Table /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.190	Amend	Considers standards should also provide for minimising the development of impervious surfaces in this zone.	Seeks to include a new standard requiring impervious surface areas to be as small as is practicable.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Standards Table /AESZ-S1: Development setback.	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.191	Support	Support	Retain	Open Submission

# AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Standards Table /AESZ-S8: Building coverage.	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.192	Oppose	Considers the maximum total building coverage per site in this zone is excessive considering the purposes of the zone.	Seeks to reduce the maximum total building coverage to a level that is more consistent with issues, objectives and policies.	Open Submission
AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone /AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotu (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone - Standards Table /AESZ-S9: Stormwater retention and treatment facilities.	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.193	Amend	Considers this is currently the only standard that is directly applicable to AESZ-R3. The Hawke's Bay Regional Council will be responsible for granting discharge consents, but the plan should also include standards for "Activities associated with stormwater collection, retention, treatment and disposal" as above.	As above the activity status for AESZ-R3A should be amended to restricted discretionary, and standards should be included that are consistent with the issues, objectives and policies in this zone.	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Standards Table /AIRPZ-S6: Fences and walls.	Susan Dallas	25.33	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.(Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Standards Table /AIRPZ-S6: Fences and walls.	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.31	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Issues /AIRPZ-I3: Management of effects.	Angie Denby	149.2	Oppose	Opposes any provision that enables buildings close to the estuary edge. Any resource consent for buildings close to the estuary boundary require consultation with mana whenua and wildlife advocacy group; requires a buffer of native plantings; buildings to be in a recessive design/colour; and stormwater to be treated. The small piece of DoC land within airport area to be retained in DoC ownership.	Seeks sufficient separation between any new building and the estuary edge. Any resource consent for buildings close to the estuary boundary require consultation with mana whenua and wildlife advocacy group; requires a buffer of native plantings; buildings to be in a recessive design/colour; and stormwater to be treated. The small piece of DoC land within airport area to be retained in DoC ownership.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Rules Table /AIRPZ-R7: Activities not otherwise provided for.	- Angie Denby	149.4	Amend	Oppose any solar farm in close proximity to the Ahuriri Estuary.	Council to have full understanding of potential impacts of solar farms of wildlife and best practice for the protection of wildlife for decision making processes.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Introduction	Sera Chambers	150.253	Amend	Considers that the wording should be changed to reference protection of the property rights for adjoining landowners which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: - A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks. Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient. -Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners. Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.	Amend as follows: <u>Infrastructure that supports economic growth, including the airport and flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, is enabled and protected while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.</u>	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Introduction	Sera Chambers	150.254	Amend	Considers that the wording should be changed to reference protection of the property rights for adjoining landowners which fits with NCC's strategic priorities:  <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks. Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient.</b>  <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners. Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.</b>	Amend to say: infrastructure that supports economic growth, including the airport and flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, is enabled and protected while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Introduction	Sera Chambers	150.255	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that the current and proposed noise overlay for the Airport do not provide for the full extent of noise disturbance from this infrastructure outside of the Inner and Outer Airport Control Boundary Overlays. It does not take into consideration health and safety and environmental impacts from increased flights over residential areas e.g. noise and dust. Adjoining landowners should be notified and able to have their say, with enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	Seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations.	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Introduction	Sera Chambers	150.256	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land (not just within overlays). Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects. Submitter notes that in other parts of NZ where an airport has increased its noise effect, consideration has been given to retrofitting acoustic insulation to existing houses depending on the noise levels.	Seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Introduction	Sera Chambers	150.257	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that the current and proposed overlays for the airport do not provide for the full extent of disturbance from this infrastructure outside of the Inner and Outer Airport Control Boundary Overlays.	Seeks for the people of Napier to continue to be allowed the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated and compensated by the entity affecting them.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Introduction	Sera Chambers	150.258	Amend	Amend to continue to allow the people of Napier the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development may impact their property and the surrounding environment and any options to have the impact mitigated and compensated by the entity affecting them or the surrounding environment.	Amend using the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Introduction	Sera Chambers	150.259	Amend	Amend to continue to allow the people of Napier the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development may impact their property and the surrounding environment and any options to have the impact mitigated and compensated by the entity affecting them or the surrounding environment.	Amend using enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Issues	Sera Chambers	150.260	Amend	Considers that the wording should be changed to reference protection of the property rights for adjoining landowners which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: - A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks. Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient. -Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners. Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.	Amend as follows: <u>infrastructure that supports economic growth, including the airport and flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, is enabled and protected while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.</u>	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Issues	Sera Chambers	150.261	Amend	Considers that the wording should be changed premised on the enjoyment of the property rights as a guiding principle which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: - <b>A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks.</b> Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient. - <b>Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners.</b> Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.	Amend as follows: <u>infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) airport and flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.</u>	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Issues	Sera Chambers	150.262	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects. Submitter notes that in other parts of NZ where an airport has increased its noise effect, consideration has been given to retrofitting acoustic insulation to existing houses depending on the noise levels.	Seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Issues /Non-airport-related activities can generate reverse sensitivity effects on the safe and efficient operation of the airport and/or detract from the vitality and vibrancy of the centre and commercial areas in Napier.	Sera Chambers	150.263	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	Seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Issues /The Airport Zone is located within a Special Landscape Character Overlay. In order to balance the landscape values with the functional requirements of the airport, development needs to be appropriately managed within the Landscape Sensitive Areas and identified view shafts.	Sera Chambers	150.264	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment within the Landscape Sensitive area and outside of this area.	Seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment within the Landscape Sensitive area and outside of this area.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Objectives  Relates to AIRPZ-11	Sera Chambers	150.265	Amend	Considers that the wording should be changed to reference protection of the property rights for adjoining landowners which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks.</b> Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient. <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners.</b> Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.	Amend as follows:  <u>infrastructure that supports economic growth, including the airport and flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, is able to develop and operate while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.</u>	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Objectives /The airport is maintained as an attractive gateway to the city and achieves a standard of amenity reflective of the role and function of the airport and its setting within the landscape known as Te Whanganui ā Orotū, as well as its proximity to Ahuriri estuary, Watchman Road Reserve, Westshore Wildlife Reserve, and the Westshore residential area.  Relates to AIRPZ-12	Sera Chambers	150.266	Amend	Considers that the wording should be amended premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected adjoining landowners as a guiding principle. Adjoining landowners should be notified and able to have their say where their enjoyment may be impacted. This fits with NCC's strategic priorities: <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks.</b> Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient. <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners.</b> Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.	Amend as follows:  <u>infrastructure that supports economic growth, including the airport and flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.</u>	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Objectives /The airport's special operational and functional needs are provided for while ensuring that the adverse effects of airport activities on the environment are avoided, remedied, or mitigated.  Relates to AIRPZ-I3	Sera Chambers	150.267	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects. Submitter notes that in other parts of NZ where an airport has increased its noise effect, consideration has been given to retrofitting acoustic insulation to existing houses depending on the noise levels.	Seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Objectives /Airport-related and non-airport activities are: compatible with the efficient, operation, maintenance, and upgrading of the airport and its associated effects; compatible with the efficient and integrated functioning of other transport networks, and managed to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on the airport.  Relates to AIRPZ-I4	Sera Chambers	150.268	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	Seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Objectives /Long distance views are maintained from the State Highway to north of the Airport entrance and from Watchman Road to the southwest.  Relates to AIRPZ-I5	Sera Chambers	150.269	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment within the Landscape Sensitive area and outside of this area.	Seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity within the Landscape Sensitive area and outside of this area.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Objectives /Development within the Airport Zone maintains and enhances the identified landscape values within the Sensitive Landscape Control Areas.  Relates to AIRPZ-I5	Sera Chambers	150.270	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment within the Landscape Sensitive area and outside of this area.	Seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity within the Landscape Sensitive area and outside of this area.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Policies /AIRPZ-P1: Airport operation and development	Sera Chambers	150.271	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	Seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Policies /Provide for airport-related activities that support the operation of the airport.  Relates to AIRPZ-O4	Sera Chambers	150.272	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	Seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Policies /Enable compatible light industrial activities within the Airport Business Precinct, where these complement the function and operation of Hawke's Bay Airport and/or the airport location, without compromising the adjacent sensitive receiving environment and/or the vitality and vibrancy of the city centre and other commercial nodes.  Relates to AIRPZ-O4	Sera Chambers	150.273	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	Seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity.	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Policies /Manage development within the Airport Zone, particularly within the Airport Business Precinct, in a way that maintains the amenity of the surrounding area and contributes to an attractive entrance to Napier.  Relates to AIRPZ-O2	Sera Chambers	150.274	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment within the Landscape Sensitive area and outside of this area.	Amend as follows: <u>infrastructure that supports economic growth, including the airport and flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.</u>	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Policies /Manage activity, building, and structure effects. Relates to AIRPZ-O3	Sera Chambers	150.275	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects. Submitter notes that in other parts of NZ where an airport has increased its noise effect, consideration has been given to retrofitting acoustic insulation to existing houses depending on the noise levels.	Seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Policies /Manage building height and form to meet the functional requirements of the airport while maintaining the identified views across the airport.  Relates to AIRPZ-O5	Sera Chambers	150.276	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment within the Landscape Sensitive area and outside of this area.	Seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity within the Landscape Sensitive area and outside of this area.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Policies /Ensure development within the Sensitive Landscape Control Areas respects the identified landscape values and manages the interface between the airport and Te Whanganui-ā-Orotū through: requiring the incorporation of a landscape buffer and planting throughout the Sensitive Landscape Control Areas 1 and 2, and encouraging lower level development, carparking, and stormwater management within Sensitive Landscape Control Area 1, and discouraging tall and bulky buildings.  Relates to AIRPZ-O6	Sera Chambers	150.277	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment within the Landscape Sensitive area and outside of this area.	Seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity within the Landscape Sensitive area and outside of this area.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Rules Table /AIRPZ-R1A  AIRPZ-R1B	Sera Chambers	150.278	Amend	Considers that the wording should be changed to reference protection of the property rights for adjoining landowners which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks.</b> <i>Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient.</i> <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners.</b> <i>Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.</i>	Amend based on position that infrastructure that supports economic growth, including the airport and flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, is enabled and protected while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission



Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Rules Table	Sera Chambers	150.279	Amend	Considers that the wording should be changed to reference protection of the property rights for adjoining landowners which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks.</b> Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient. <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners.</b> Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.	Amend based on position that infrastructure that supports economic growth, including the airport and flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, is enabled and protected while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Rules Table /AIRPZ-R3: Cafes located outside the terminal buildings within the Airport Business Precinct	Sera Chambers	150.280	Amend	Considers that the wording should be changed to reference protection of the property rights for adjoining landowners which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks.</b> Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient. <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners.</b> Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.	Amend based on position that infrastructure that supports economic growth, including cafes located outside the terminal buildings within the Airport Business Precinct and flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, is enabled and protected while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Rules Table /AIRPZ-R4A  AIRPZ-R4B	Sera Chambers	150.281	Amend	Considers that the wording should be changed to reference protection of the property rights for adjoining landowners which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks.</b> Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient. <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners.</b> Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.	Amend based on position that infrastructure that supports economic growth, including light manufacturing and servicing (including cafes located outside the terminal buildings within the Airport Business Precinct and flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, is enabled and protected while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Rules Table /AIRPZ-R5A  AIRPZ-R5B	Sera Chambers	150.282	Amend	Considers that the wording should be changed to reference protection of the property rights for adjoining landowners which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks.</b> Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient. <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners.</b> Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.	Amend based on position that infrastructure that supports economic growth, including warehousing, transport depots (excluding livestock or logging freight), and vehicle sales (and ancillary retailing or office) within the Airport Business Precinct and flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, is enabled and protected while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Rules Table /AIRPZ-R6A  AIRPZ-R6B	Sera Chambers	150.283	Amend	Considers that the wording should be changed to reference protection of the property rights for adjoining landowners which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks.</b> <i>Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient.</i> <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners.</b> <i>Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.</i>	Amend based on position that infrastructure that supports economic growth, including research and innovation activities (and ancillary retailing) within the Airport Business Precinct and flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, is enabled and protected while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Rules Table /Activity Status: Non-complying	Sera Chambers	150.284	Amend	Considers that the wording should be changed to reference protection of the property rights for adjoining landowners which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks.</b> <i>Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient.</i> <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners.</b> <i>Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.</i>	Amend based on position that infrastructure that supports economic growth, including activities not otherwise provided for (including all retailing, commercial, and industrial activities not otherwise provided for in AIRPZ-R5 to AIRPZ-R6) and flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, is enabled and protected while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Landscape Sensitive Control Areas 1 and 2 and View Shaft Control Area Rules Table /Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary A	Sera Chambers	150.285	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment within the Landscape Sensitive area and outside of this area which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks.</b> <i>Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient.</i> <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners.</b> <i>Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.</i>	Amend based on position that infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Landscape Sensitive Control Areas 1 and 2 and View Shaft Control Area Rules Table	Sera Chambers	150.286	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment within the Landscape Sensitive area and outside of this area which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks.</b> <i>Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient.</i> <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners.</b> <i>Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.</i>	Amend based on position that infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Standards Table / Purpose: to maintain the character, landscape, and cultural values of the northern entrance to the city while enabling development that can accommodate activities appropriate in the Airport Zone as well as reduce dominating impacts on adjacent activities and ecological habitats.	Sera Chambers	150.287	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment within the Landscape Sensitive area, the overall site coverage threshold in the Airport Business Precinct and outside of this area which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks.</b> Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient. <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners.</b> Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.	Amend based on position that infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Standards Table /Purpose: to maintain the character, amenity, landscape, and cultural values of the northern entrance to the city while enabling development that can accommodate activities appropriate in the Airport Zone.	Sera Chambers	150.288	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment within the Landscape Sensitive area, the General Height Control Area and outside of this area which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks.</b> Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient. <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners.</b> Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.	Amend based on position that infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Standards Table /Purpose: to maintain the character, landscape, and cultural values of the northern entrance to the city while enabling development that can accommodate activities appropriate in the Airport Zone as well as reduce dominating impacts on adjacent activities.	Sera Chambers	150.289	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment within the Landscape Sensitive area, the height in relation to boundary area and outside of this area which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks.</b> Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient. <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners.</b> Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.	Amend based on position that infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Standards Table /Purpose: to maintain amenity to surrounding zones while recognising the functional and operational requirements of the airport.	Sera Chambers	150.290	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment within the Landscape Sensitive area, the yard area and outside of this area which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks.</b> Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient. <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners.</b> Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.	Amend based on position that infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Standards Table /Purpose: to provide for the functional needs of activities while ensuring storage areas do not detract from the visual amenity of the Airport Zone, public roads, and adjoining zones, or adversely affect people's health and safety and the quality of the environment.	Sera Chambers	150.291	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment within the Landscape Sensitive area, the outdoor storage (including refuse storage) area and outside of this area which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks.</b> Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient. <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners.</b> Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.	Amend based on position that infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Standards Table /Purpose: to provide for safety and attractiveness of streetscapes.	Sera Chambers	150.292	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment within the Landscape Sensitive area, the fence and walls area and outside of this area which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks.</b> Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient. <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners.</b> Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.	Amend based on position that infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Standards Table /	Sera Chambers	150.293	Amend	Seeks amendment based on position that infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend based on position that infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Assessment criteria /	Sera Chambers	150.294	Amend	Seeks to amend based on position that infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend based on position that infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Assessment criteria /	Sera Chambers	150.295	Amend	Seeks to amend based on position that infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend based on position that infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Assessment criteria /	Sera Chambers	150.296	Amend	Seeks to amend based on position that infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend based on position that infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Assessment criteria /The availability of daylight to adjoining properties. The effects on the privacy of adjoining properties.	Sera Chambers	150.297	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment within the Landscape Sensitive area and outside of this area which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: - A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks. Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient. -Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners. Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.	Amend based on position that infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Assessment criteria /AIRPZ-AC5: Infringement of landscaping standard (AIRPZ-S7)	Sera Chambers	150.298	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment within the Landscape Sensitive area and outside of this area which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks. Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient.</b> <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners. Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.</b>	Amend based on position that infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Assessment criteria /For discretionary activities, Council's assessment is not restricted to these matters, but it may consider them (among other factors). For restricted discretionary activity, the assessment is restricted to those matters set out below.	Sera Chambers	150.299	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment within the function of the Airport Zone area and outside of this area which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks.</b> Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient. <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners.</b> Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.	Amend based on position that infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Assessment criteria /Function of commercial zones Whether the activity will compromise the function of industrial and commercial zones in the city.	Sera Chambers	150.300	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment within the function of commercial zones area and outside of this area which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks.</b> Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient. <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners.</b> Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.	Amend for all aspects of AIRPZ-AC6 based on position that infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Assessment criteria /Amenity and landscape character and ecological habitat.	Sera Chambers	150.301	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment within the function of the Amenity and landscape character and ecological habitat area and outside of this area which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks.</b> Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient. <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners.</b> Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.	Amend for all aspects of AIRPZ-AC6 based on position that infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Assessment criteria /Safe and efficient transport network	Sera Chambers	150.302	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment within the safe and efficient transport network and outside of this area which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks.</b> Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient. <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners.</b> Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.	Amend for all aspects of AIRPZ-AC6 based on position that infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Assessment criteria /Infrastructure and servicing.	Sera Chambers	150.303	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment within the infrastructure and servicing area and outside of this area which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks.</b> Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient. <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners.</b> Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.	Amend for all aspects of AIRPZ-AC6 based on position that infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Assessment criteria /The extent to which the integrated site layout, building, and landscape design provides a high quality and visually attractive frontage to Te Whanganui-ā-Orotū/Westshore Wildlife Reserve. The extent to which development layout seeks to incorporate carparking and stormwater management devices within Landscape Sensitive Control Area 1 as opposed to buildings to manage the transition between the airport and Te Whanganui-ā-Orotū. The extent to which planting is designed to achieve a regular structure and rhythm along State Highway reinforcing a gateway to the city/airport.	Sera Chambers	150.304	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment within the Landscape Sensitive area and outside of this area which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks.</b> Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient. <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners.</b> Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.	Amend based on position that infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Assessment criteria /The extent to which buildings and structures within identified view shafts impact on key views across the Airport Zone, and the extent to which mitigation measures reduce the impacts on key views.	Sera Chambers	150.305	Amend	Amend premised on the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners as a guiding principle by being notified and able to have their say, including the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment within the Landscape Sensitive area and outside of this area which fits with NCC's strategic priorities: <b>- A resilient city - the ability to thrive and withstand impacts, knocks and shocks.</b> Council makes good future planning and investment decisions to prepare for a changing climate future and enables our community to build self-reliance. Our people, our economy and infrastructure is resilient. <b>-Nurturing authentic relationships with our community and partners.</b> Council fosters meaningful relationships, demonstrating our commitment to listen to our community's needs, concerns, and aspirations.	Amend based on position that infrastructure that requires development, including Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd (HBAL) flights/charter/helicopters/other aircraft travelling over Napier residents' properties, needs to balance the lasting impacts of its activities while allowing adjoining landowners to be notified on changes and to be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting them including compensation from the business/entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Introduction /	Ellen Robotham	198.75	Amend	<p>Seeks to amend the wording in the introduction of this chapter. The designation also provides for forecasted growth, therefore enable more than “current operations”.</p> <p>The proposed wording provides clarity regarding the different plan mechanisms which control adverse effects associated with airport activities. The designation includes conditions relating to the management of noise arising from airport activities in order to manage adverse effects on nearby activities sensitive to aircraft noise. Meanwhile, the noise chapter includes provisions which manage reverse sensitivity effects and avoid noise sensitive activities establishing within close proximity to the Airport.</p> <p>Reference to airport related activities is deleted as a consequential amendment.</p> <p>A more integrated approach to managing landscape effects is sought to reduce overlapping consent considerations and ensure the Airport Zone is effective and efficient.</p> <p>Refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning.</p>	<p>Amend as follows: The airport is a <u>nationally and regionally significant regional</u> infrastructure asset that facilitates access and economic activity in the local and broader regional economies...</p> <p>... Hawke’s Bay Airport Limited (HBAL) holds designations over land located within the Airport Zone that <del>enable current operations</del>, a range of airport activities, <del>and airport related activities</del>. Aircraft operations are managed through the designation conditions. ...</p> <p>... Matters relating to activities sensitive to aircraft noise within the <u>Aircraft Noise Overlay Inner and Outer Control Boundary overlays for aircraft operations</u> noise are addressed in both the Noise chapter. <u>The effects of aircraft noise on the surrounding communities is addressed through</u> <del>and</del> the Airport Purpose Designation. ...</p> <p>The Airport Zone is located within a Special Landscape Character Overlay. However the provisions of the Natural Features and Landscape chapter do not apply within the Airport Zone. <del>There are two Landscape Sensitive Areas within the zone where development needs to be managed to not detract from the identified landscape values. These are managed as specific control</del></p>	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Issues /AIRPZ-11: Airport - regionally important infrastructure.	Ellen Robotham	198.76	Amend	<p>The issue appropriately recognises the unique role and function of the Airport in the Hawke’s Bay transport network and its contribution to the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the region.</p>	<p>Amend as follows: Hawke’s Bay Airport is a <u>nationally and regionally significant important</u> infrastructure...</p>	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Issues /AIRPZ-12: Attractiveness of the Hawke’s Bay Airport gateway for visitors and residents.	Ellen Robotham	198.77	Amend	<p>Seeks to amend Issue 2 in a way that focuses on ensuring development at the Airport is cohesive with the surrounding landscape without compromising the functional and operational needs of the Airport.</p>	<p>Amend as follows: <u>Hawke’s Bay Airport is located within the Te Whanganui-a-Orotu Special Character Landscape and is As</u> a key gateway to the region, <del>Hawke’s Bay Airport</del> <u>contributing es</u> to the first and last impressions of visitors and residents to the city and region. Development at the airport <del>therefore</del>, needs to <u>provide for balance the lasting impacts of its activities on visitors and residents with</u> the functional and operational <u>requirements imperatives</u> of the airport <del>d</del>. <del>This necessitates managing the built form of buildings and structures</del> to maintain a coherent form of development in a sensitive landscape.</p>	Open Submission



# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Issues /AIRPZ-I3: Management of effects.	Ellen Robotham	198.78	Amend	<p>Considers that the Airport is well buffered from adjoining residential areas by public reserves, estuarine environments, rural land, and terrestrial transport routes, and that HBAL the effects of noise, light and transportation need to be managed at the airport. Such matters are covered by other chapters of the plan and it is therefore unnecessary to duplicate those considerations in this issue statement.</p> <p>Adverse effects on wetlands may not always be able to be avoided due to the functional and operational constraints of the Airport. It is noted that the NPS-FM and NES-F provide pathways for specified infrastructure, including airport activities, to manage adverse effects through the effects management hierarchy so effects do not have to be avoided. This is managed through Regional Council consent processes.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>The land within the AIRPZ - Airport Zone is generally well buffered from adjoining residential areas by public reserves, estuarine environments, rural land, and terrestrial transport routes. <del>However, some airport operations may generate adverse effects beyond the zone that require careful management, such as noise, light, and transportation.</del></p> <p>The airport adjoins the ecologically sensitive areas of Te Whanga (Ahuriri Estuary), Watchman Road Reserve, and Westshore Wildlife Reserve, which are important wetlands and represent some of the few remaining coastal wetlands along the east coast of New Zealand.</p> <p>Activities within the Airport Zone need to be carefully managed to ensure that any adverse effects on these wetlands are <del>avoided</del>. <u>managed in accordance with the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management.</u></p>	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Issues /AIRPZ-I4: Compatibility of non-airport-related activities.	Ellen Robotham	198.79	Support	Considers it is important that the function and operation of the Airport is maintained.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Issues /AIRPZ-I5: Special landscape character values.	Ellen Robotham	198.80	Support	<p>Considers a more integrated management approach to landscape values is proposed, with suggested changes to AIRPZ-I2 being proposed.</p> <p>If not deleted, case law indicates two distinctive definitions for functional and operational requirements. Wording should be updated to reflect that both are relevant when considering requirements of the Airport.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>The Airport Zone is located within <del>a</del> the Te Whanganui-a-Orotū Special Landscape Character Overlay. In order to balance the landscape values with the functional <u>and operational</u> requirements of the airport, development needs to be appropriately managed within the <u>Airport Business Precinct Landscape Sensitive Areas and identified view shafts.</u></p>	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Objectives /AIRPZ-O1: Airport - regionally important infrastructure. Relates to AIRPZ-I1	Ellen Robotham	198.81	Amend	Amendments are sought to ensure the objective appropriately recognises the unique role and function of the Airport in the Hawke's Bay transport network and its contribution to the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the region.	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Hawke's Bay Airport is a <u>nationally and regionally significant</u> <del>important</del> infrastructure...</p>	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Objectives /AIRPZ-O2: Character and amenity. Relates to AIRPZ-I2	Ellen Robotham	198.82	Oppose	Considers the notified wording of AIRPZ-O2 is considered to place too much weight on the amenity of residential neighbours which, as identified in AIRPZ-I3, is well buffered from surrounding areas.	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>The airport is maintained as an attractive gateway to the city and achieves a standard of amenity reflective of the role and function of the airport and its setting within the landscape known as Te Whanganui ā Orotū, as well as its proximity to Ahuriri estuary, Watchman Road Reserve, Westshore and Wildlife Reserve, <del>and the Westshore residential area.</del></p>	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Objectives /AIRPZ-O3: Management of environmental effects. Relates to AIRPZ-I3	Ellen Robotham	198.83	Amend	Considers amendments are required to align with NU-O2 and reflect the Airport's status as a network utility with operational and functional requirements.	<p>Amend AIRPZ-O3 as follows:</p> <p>The airport's special operational and functional needs are provided for while ensuring that the adverse effects of airport activities on the environment are avoided, remedied, or <u>mitigated as far as practicable.</u></p>	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Objectives /AIRPZ-O4: Compatibility of activities with the airport operation. Relates to AIRPZ-I4	Ellen Robotham	198.84	Amend	Seeks a consequential amendment for deleting airport related activities and ensuring defined terms are able to be hyper-linked.	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>AIRPZ-O4: Compatibility of activities with the airport operation <del>Airport-related and Non-airport</del> activities are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) compatible with the efficient, operation, maintenance, and upgrading of the airport and its associated effects;</li> <li>b) compatible with the efficient and integrated functioning of other transport networks, and</li> <li>c) managed to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on the airport.</li> </ul>	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Objectives /AIRPZ-05: Special landscape character values - view shaft.  Relates to AIRPZ-15	Ellen Robotham	198.85	Oppose	<p>The Proposed Plan includes a number of mechanisms to protect landscape values within the Airport Zone including the Special Landscape Overlay, Viewshafts, and two Sensitive Landscape Control Areas.</p> <p>The approach as notified, does not provide clear guidance to plan users regarding the types of activities that are appropriate within these areas, and duplicates matters which are already accounted for in the main rule framework. HBAL recommend the landscape management framework in the Airport Zone is amended to remove duplication and provide for activities of appropriate scale as permitted activities.</p> <p>An assessment undertaken by Wayfinder (refer Appendix 3 of full submission), concludes some limitations of the viewshafts identified and have made a number of recommendations. As a result, HBAL request that the proposed viewshafts are deleted and all provisions in the Airport Zone relating to viewshafts are also deleted as a consequential amendment. Alternative viewshafts have been suggested.</p> <p>HBAL request that the description of Te Whanganui-a-Orotū Special landscape Character is amended to more closely reflect the area's present character, and as modified by the Airport. The Isthmus Napier Landscape Study recognises that the area is not natural enough to be considered 'Outstanding' and that the Airport is an area of greater development intensity.</p> <p>HBAL consider that the Special Landscape Control Areas and associated rule AIRPZ-R9 are unnecessary and should be deleted. Issues, objectives and</p>	Delete.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Objectives /AIRPZ-06: Special landscape character values - sensitive landscape control areas.  Relates to AIRPZ-15	Ellen Robotham	198.86	Oppose	<p>The Proposed Plan includes a number of mechanisms to protect landscape values within the Airport Zone including the Special Landscape Overlay, Viewshafts, and two Sensitive Landscape Control Areas.</p> <p>The approach as notified, does not provide clear guidance to plan users regarding the types of activities that are appropriate within these areas, and duplicates matters which are already accounted for in the main rule framework. HBAL recommend the landscape management framework in the Airport Zone is amended to remove duplication and provide for activities of appropriate scale as permitted activities.</p> <p>An assessment undertaken by Wayfinder (refer Appendix 3 of full submission), concludes some limitations of the viewshafts identified and have made a number of recommendations. As a result, HBAL request that the proposed viewshafts are deleted and all provisions in the Airport Zone relating to viewshafts are also deleted as a consequential amendment. Alternative viewshafts have been suggested.</p> <p>HBAL request that the description of Te Whanganui-a-Orotū Special landscape Character is amended to more closely reflect the area's present character, and as modified by the Airport. The Isthmus Napier Landscape Study recognises that the area is not natural enough to be considered 'Outstanding' and that the Airport is an area of greater development intensity.</p> <p>HBAL consider that the Special Landscape Control Areas and associated rule AIRPZ-R9 are unnecessary and should be deleted. Issues, objectives and</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>AIRPZ-06: Special landscape character values —<del>sensitive landscape control areas</del></p> <p>Development within the Airport Zone maintains <del>and enhances</del> the identified landscape values within the <u>Te Whanganui-a-Orotū Special Character Landscape Overlay</u> <del>Sensitive Landscape Control Areas</del>.</p>	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Policies /AIRPZ-P1: Airport operation and development.  Relates to AIRPZ-O1, AIRPZ-O4	Ellen Robotham	198.87	Amend	Considers the deletion of the term Airport Related Activities means the difference between AIRPZ-P1 and AIRPZ-P2 is arbitrary, with both policies essentially relating to the enablement of airport activities. These two policies are proposed to be replaced by one new policy.  This new policy more coherently gives effect to AIRPZ-O1 and AIRPZ-O4 by establishing the key purpose of the Airport Zone.	Delete AIRPZ-P1 and P2 and replace with new policy as follows: <u>AIRPZ-PX: Airport Activities</u>  <u>Recognise and provide for the operation and development of the Hawke’s Bay Airport by:</u>  1. <u>enabling airport activities;</u>  2. <u>enabling activities which support the economic resilience of the airport;</u>  3. <u>supporting carbon neutral outcomes, including through transport decarbonisation, and renewable or low carbon energy generation, storage, and use; and</u>  4. <u>ensuring the airport is not constrained or compromised by reverse sensitivity effects and conflict between incompatible activities.</u>	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Policies /AIRPZ-P2: Airport-related activities.  Relates to AIRPZ-O4	Ellen Robotham	198.88	Amend	Considers the deletion of the term Airport Related Activities means the difference between AIRPZ-P1 and AIRPZ-P2 is arbitrary, with both policies essentially relating to the enablement of airport activities. These two policies are proposed to be replaced by one new policy.  This new policy more coherently gives effect to AIRPZ-O1 and AIRPZ-O4 by establishing the key purpose of the Airport Zone.	Delete AIRPZ-P1 and P2 and replace with new policy as follows: <u>AIRPZ-PX: Airport Activities</u>  <u>Recognise and provide for the operation and development of the Hawke’s Bay Airport by:</u>  1. <u>enabling airport activities;</u>  2. <u>enabling activities which support the economic resilience of the airport;</u>  3. <u>supporting carbon neutral outcomes, including through transport decarbonisation, and renewable or low carbon energy generation, storage, and use; and</u>  4. <u>ensuring the airport is not constrained or compromised by reverse sensitivity effects and conflict between incompatible activities.</u>	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Policies /AIRPZ-P3: Non-airport activities within the Airport Business Precinct.  Relates to AIRPZ-O4	Ellen Robotham	198.89	Amend	As demonstrated by economic evidence, a number of activities are considered compatible with the Airport so this policy should not limit consideration of compatible activities to light industrial activities only.  It does not make sense to require compatible activities to complement the location of the airport. The location of the airport is fixed.  It is considered more appropriate to require the management of adverse effects arising from compatible non-airport activities than require that they do not “compromise”. AIRPZ-P5 already requires the management of adverse effects so it does not need to be repeated in AIRPZ-P3.	Amend as follows:  Enable compatible <del>light industrial</del> activities within the Airport Business Precinct, where these complement the function and operation of Hawke’s Bay Airport, <u>would benefit from locating within an airport setting and appropriately manage effects on the Airport and/or the airport location, without compromising the adjacent sensitive receiving environment and/or the vitality and vibrancy of the city centre and other commercial nodes.</u>	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Policies /AIRPZ-P4: Airport built environment.  Relates to AIRPZ-O2	Ellen Robotham	198.90	Support	The matters are appropriate for managing the built environment and maintaining the amenity of the gateway experience.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Policies /AIRPZ-P5: Management of effects.  Relates to AIRPZ-O3	Ellen Robotham	198.91	Amend	<p>Considers that activities should be compatible with the role and function of the Airport, not the Airport Zone. The role and function of the Airport Zone, as with any zone, is to manage activities in a given area.</p> <p>Reverse sensitivity is generally managed by HBAL's designations and noise contours. Refer full submission.</p> <p>The grammar of clause 7 does not match rest of drafting, and is potentially inconsistent with the direction of the opening sentence.</p> <p>Clause 8 does not appropriately weight the operational and functional requirements of the Airport and the suggested wording reflects amendments to AIRPZ-O2.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Manage activity, building, and structure effects, having regard to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>compatibility with the role and function of the Airport Zone;</li> <li>whether the activity, building, or structure is ancillary to and/or supports airport activities;</li> <li>safety, security, and resilience of the airport (and surrounding infrastructure) as an air and land transport hub;</li> <li>efficiency, capacity, and safety of the transport network that services the airport;</li> <li>whether the activity can be appropriately serviced, including wastewater, stormwater, and potable drinking water supply;</li> <li><del>potential reverse sensitivity with established or permitted activities on adjoining and adjacent land outside the Airport Zone;</del></li> <li>the effects on the activity on the ecologically sensitive Ahuriri Estuary, Watchman Road Reserve, and Westshore Wildlife Reserve <del>are minimised</del>, and</li> <li>whether the activity achieves a level of amenity reflective of <u>the Airport's operational and functional requirements and its proximity to Ahuriri Estuary, Watchman Road Reserve, Westshore Wildlife Reserve, and Westshore residential area.</u></li> </ol>	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Policies /AIRPZ-P6: Special landscape character values - view shafts.  Relates to AIRPZ-O5	Ellen Robotham	198.92	Oppose	<p>Considers that the approach to managing landscape values does not provide plan users with clear guidance regarding types of activities that are appropriate within these areas and duplicates matters already accounted for in the main rule framework. Recommends that framework to manage landscape values is amended to avoid duplication and provide for an appropriate scale of permitted activities. Alternative view shafts are suggested and provisions to manage these are suggested to be included in the NFL chapter. Considers it necessary to also make changes to the description of Te Whanganui-ā-Orotū Special Landscape Character to more closely reflect the areas current character and to the provisions managing this character so that those activities and scale of development expected to occur t the Airport are provided for.</p>	Delete AIRPZ-P6	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Policies /AIRPZ-P7: Special landscape character values - sensitive landscape control areas.  Relates to AIRPZ-O6	Ellen Robotham	198.93	Amend	<p>Considers that the approach to managing landscape values does not provide plan users with clear guidance regarding types of activities that are appropriate within these areas and duplicates matters already accounted for in the main rule framework. Recommends that framework to manage landscape values is amended to avoid duplication and provide for an appropriate scale of permitted activities. Alternative view shafts are suggested and provisions to manage these are suggested to be included in the NFL chapter. Considers it necessary to also make changes to the description of Te Whanganui-ā-Orotū Special Landscape Character to more closely reflect the areas current character and to the provisions managing this character so that those activities and scale of development expected to occur at the Airport are provided for.</p> <p>Refer to full submission for more detail.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>AIRPZ-P7: Special landscape character values <del>—sensitive landscape control areas</del></p> <p>Ensure development within the <u>Airport Business Precinct Sensitive Landscape Control Areas</u> has regard to the <u>identified landscape values of the Te Whanganui-a-Orotū Special Character Landscape Overlay</u>, <del>respects the identified landscape values and manages the interface between the airport and Te Whanganui-ā-Orotū through:</del></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>requiring the incorporation of a landscape buffer and planting throughout the Sensitive Landscape Control Areas 1 and 2, and</del></li> <li><del>encouraging lower level development, carparking, and stormwater management within Sensitive Landscape Control Area 1, and discouraging tall and bulky buildings.</del></li> </ol>	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Rules Table /General	Ellen Robotham	198.94	Amend	<p>Submission point of general nature with attached table showing requested changes throughout Airport Zone chapter. Each change is requested through separate submission points within this submission. In summary, considers that the rule references are incorrect, do not reflect the numbering system used in column one and, in some cases, appear to relate to conditions that do not exist.</p> <p>Amendments to conditions and matters of discretion are requested to correct cross- references and ensure that matters of discretion where compliance with a standard are not achieved are restricted to the assessment criteria related to that standard only and to simplify and streamline the overlap between Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria. New rules are proposed to be inserted in accordance with economic evidence as set out in HBAL's full submission. A new standard is proposed to provide confidence to NCC that new developments will be appropriately serviced. Refer to separate submission points or full submission for more detailed explanation of changes requested.</p>	Relief sought can be found in separate submission points or refer to full submission for details of requested changes to Airport Zone chapter.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Landscape Sensitive Control Areas 1 and 2 and View Shaft Control Area Rules Table /General	Ellen Robotham	198.95	Oppose	<p>The Proposed Plan includes a number of mechanisms to protect landscape values within the Airport Zone including the Special Landscape Overlay, Viewshafts, and two Sensitive Landscape Control Areas.</p> <p>The approach as notified, does not provide clear guidance to plan users regarding the types of activities that are appropriate within these areas, and duplicates matters which are already accounted for in the main rule framework. HBAL recommend the landscape management framework in the Airport Zone is amended to remove duplication and provide for activities of appropriate scale as permitted activities.</p> <p>An assessment undertaken by Wayfinder (refer Appendix 3 of full submission), concludes some limitations of the viewshafts identified and have made a number of recommendations. As a result, HBAL request that the proposed viewshafts are deleted and all provisions in the Airport Zone relating to viewshafts are also deleted as a consequential amendment. Alternative viewshafts have been suggested.</p> <p>HBAL request that the description of Te Whanganui-a-Orotū Special landscape Character is amended to more closely reflect the area's present character, and as modified by the Airport. The Isthmus Napier Landscape Study recognises that the area is not natural enough to be considered 'Outstanding' and that the Airport is an area of greater development intensity.</p> <p>HBAL consider that the Special Landscape Control Areas and associated rule AIRPZ-R9 are unnecessary and should be deleted. Issues, objectives and</p>	Delete table. Delete AIRPZ-R8. Delete AIRPZ-R9.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Standards Table /General	Ellen Robotham	198.96	Amend	<p>Submission is of a general nature and relates to the standards table of the Airport Zone. Submission points specific to each standard can be found in separate submission points. Activity status where compliance with a standard is not met has already been provided in the Rule Table. Some of the activity statuses and matters for discretion contradict those in the Rule Table and create confusion for plan users. This leads to inefficient resource consent applications which require repetitive assessments for similar, overlapping matters of discretion against the rule conditions and the standards. Refer to full submission.</p>	Relief sought can be found in separate submission points. Refer to full submission for outline of changes requested.	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Assessment criteria /	Ellen Robotham	198.97	Amend	<p>Considers that the proposed wording provides a greater level of clarity regarding the Council's matters of discretion.</p> <p>The Council is not limited in its discretion for applications for Discretionary or Non- Complying activities and is therefore not required to identify matters of discretion for those applications.</p> <p>There is no stated rule purpose. A purpose is only included for standards.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>When considering an application <u>for a Controlled or a Restricted Discretionary Activity</u>, the Council will have regard to the <del>relevant</del> objectives and policies of this plan <u>relevant to the condition or standard that was not complied with</u>, the purpose of the <del>rules and</del> standards, and regard will also be had to the relevant assessment criteria set out below.</p>	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Assessment criteria /AIRPZ-AC1: Infringement of general height control and height in relation to boundary standards (AIRPZ-S2 and AIRPZ-S3).	Ellen Robotham	198.98	Amend	<p>The Proposed Plan includes a number of mechanisms to protect landscape values within the Airport Zone including the Special Landscape Overlay, Viewshafts, and two Sensitive Landscape Control Areas.</p> <p>The approach as notified, does not provide clear guidance to plan users regarding the types of activities that are appropriate within these areas, and duplicates matters which are already accounted for in the main rule framework. HBAL recommend the landscape management framework in the Airport Zone is amended to remove duplication and provide for activities of appropriate scale as permitted activities.</p> <p>An assessment undertaken by Wayfinder (refer Appendix 3 of full submission), concludes some limitations of the viewshafts identified and have made a number of recommendations. As a result, HBAL request that the proposed viewshafts are deleted and all provisions in the Airport Zone relating to viewshafts are also deleted as a consequential amendment. Alternative viewshafts have been suggested.</p> <p>HBAL request that the description of Te Whanganui-a-Orotū Special landscape Character is amended to more closely reflect the area's present character, and as modified by the Airport. The Isthmus Napier Landscape Study recognises that the area is not natural enough to be considered 'Outstanding' and that the Airport is an area of greater development intensity.</p> <p>HBAL consider that the Special Landscape Control Areas and associated rule AIRPZ-R9 are unnecessary and should be deleted. Issues, objectives and</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>a) The extent to which the additional height is necessary for the operational or functional needs of the airport, or <del>otherwise</del> results in adverse effects on the safe, efficient, and effective function and operation of Hawke's Bay Airport.</p> <p>b) The extent to which the additional height results in adverse bulk and dominance effects and/or shading on adjoining sites or publicly accessible areas.</p> <p>c) The extent to which the building or structure has the potential to become a dominant feature in the landscape.</p> <p>d) The ability to mitigate any potential adverse effects.</p> <p>e) <del>Whether proposals for additional height avoid locating within Landscape Sensitive Control Area 1 or 2, or a View Shaft Control Area.</del></p> <p>f) <u>Whether the development will detract from the identified values of the Te Whanganui-ā-Orotū Special Landscape Character.</u></p>	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Assessment criteria /AIRPZ-AC2: Infringement of yard standard (AIRPZ-S4).	Ellen Robotham	198.99	Support	<p>The assessment criteria are relevant to and appropriate for non-compliance with AIRPZ-S4.</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Assessment criteria /AIRPZ-AC3: Infringement of outdoor storage (including refuse storage) standard (AIRPZ-S5).	Ellen Robotham	198.100	Support	<p>The assessment criteria are relevant to and appropriate for non-compliance with AIRPZ-S5.</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Assessment criteria /AIRPZ-AC4: Infringement of fences and walls standard (AIRPZ-S6)	Ellen Robotham	198.101	Amend	<p>Assessment criteria b does not relate to the purpose of AIRPZ-S6 and is not considered relevant in the context of the Airport Zone.</p> <p>Assessment criteria c is considered to be adequately assessed under AIRPZ-AC1 which relates to height of buildings.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>AIRPZ-AC4: Infringement of fences and walls standard (AIRPZ-S6)</p> <p>a) The availability of daylight to adjoining properties.</p> <p>b) <del>The effects on the privacy of adjoining properties.</del></p> <p>c) <del>The scale and bulk of the building in relation to the site and area.</del></p> <p>d) The effects on character and amenity values of the site and area.</p>	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Assessment criteria / AIRPZ-AC5: Infringement of landscaping standard (AIRPZ-S7)	Ellen Robotham	198.102	Amend	<p>The Proposed Plan includes a number of mechanisms to protect landscape values within the Airport Zone including the Special Landscape Overlay, Viewshafts, and two Sensitive Landscape Control Areas.</p> <p>The approach as notified, does not provide clear guidance to plan users regarding the types of activities that are appropriate within these areas, and duplicates matters which are already accounted for in the main rule framework. HBAL recommend the landscape management framework in the Airport Zone is amended to remove duplication and provide for activities of appropriate scale as permitted activities.</p> <p>An assessment undertaken by Wayfinder (refer Appendix 3 of full submission), concludes some limitations of the viewshafts identified and have made a number of recommendations. As a result, HBAL request that the proposed viewshafts are deleted and all provisions in the Airport Zone relating to viewshafts are also deleted as a consequential amendment. Alternative viewshafts have been suggested.</p> <p>HBAL request that the description of Te Whanganui-a-Orotū Special landscape Character is amended to more closely reflect the area's present character, and as modified by the Airport. The Isthmus Napier Landscape Study recognises that the area is not natural enough to be considered 'Outstanding' and that the Airport is an area of greater development intensity.</p> <p>HBAL consider that the Special Landscape Control Areas and associated rule AIRPZ-R9 are unnecessary and should be deleted. Issues, objectives and</p>	<p>AIRPZ-AC5: Infringement of landscaping standard (AIRPZ-S7)</p> <p>a) The ability to ensure a high-quality airport gateway is provided.</p> <p>b) <del>The visual effects of buildings and activities when viewed from State Highway 2, Watchman Road, and the Airport Link Road.</del></p> <p>c) <u>Whether the development will detract from the identified values of the Te Whanganui-ā-Orotū Special Landscape Character.</u></p>	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Assessment criteria /General	Ellen Robotham	198.103	Amend	<p>Submitter seeks a consequential amendment to reflect addition of new standard AIRPZ-S8</p>	<p>Insert new assessment criteria as follows:</p> <p><u>AIRPZ-ACX: Servicing</u></p> <p>a) <u>Whether the development can be sufficiently serviced by water, wastewater, and stormwater infrastructure, including through the use of low-impact stormwater design, where appropriate.</u></p> <p>b) <u>Whether the proposed servicing will have an adverse effect on ecological habitat, including any adverse effects on the Ahuriri estuary and its margins.</u></p>	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Assessment criteria /AIRPZ-AC6: General.	Ellen Robotham	198.104	Oppose	<p>Considers that assessment criteria should be more focused. Amendments are proposed to delete criteria which is not relevant to a Restricted Discretionary activity, or are more appropriately considered under another assessment criteria.</p> <p>For example, it is unnecessary for each application to provide economic evidence. The FDS has demonstrated reliance on industrial development at the Airport and the Property Economics report has identified activities which can occur without adverse economic distribution effects on the Centres Hierarchy.</p> <p>HBAL also request that the application of matters of discretion are simplified, and duplication is removed. The rule table contains matters of discretion for each rule, and the standards table also includes matters of discretion for each standard. This approach is highly repetitive and is not effective or efficient.</p>	<p>AIRPZ-AC6: General</p> <p><del>For discretionary activities, Council's assessment is not restricted to these matters, but it may consider them (among other factors). For restricted discretionary activity, the assessment is restricted to those matters set out below.</del></p> <p>Function of the Airport Zone</p> <p>a) Whether the activity will compromise the functional and operational requirements of airport activities, including planned or potential growth of Hawke's Bay Airport.</p> <p>b) Whether the proposed land use will have an adverse actual or potential effect on the safety, efficiency, and operation (including landings and take-offs) of Hawke's Bay Airport.</p> <p><del>Function of commercial zones</del></p> <p><del>c) Whether the activity will compromise the function of industrial and commercial zones in the city. Amenity and landscape character and eEcological habitat</del></p> <p><del>d) Whether the development to accommodate the activity will detract from the local landscape character and visual amenity of the airport, particularly as perceived from the airport terminal, streets, public open spaces, and residential sites.</del></p> <p><del>e) Whether the development is in a strategic site and contributes positively to the gateway experience.</del></p> <p><del>f) Whether the hours of operation accommodated within the development would will adversely affect the amenity,</del></p>	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Assessment criteria /AIRPZ-AC7: Development in Landscape Sensitive Control Areas 1 and 2.	Ellen Robotham	198.105	Oppose	<p>The Proposed Plan includes a number of mechanisms to protect landscape values within the Airport Zone including the Special Landscape Overlay, Viewshafts, and two Sensitive Landscape Control Areas.</p> <p>The approach as notified, does not provide clear guidance to plan users regarding the types of activities that are appropriate within these areas, and duplicates matters which are already accounted for in the main rule framework. HBAL recommend the landscape management framework in the Airport Zone is amended to remove duplication and provide for activities of appropriate scale as permitted activities.</p> <p>An assessment undertaken by Wayfinder (refer Appendix 3 of full submission), concludes some limitations of the viewshafts identified and have made a number of recommendations. As a result, HBAL request that the proposed viewshafts are deleted and all provisions in the Airport Zone relating to viewshafts are also deleted as a consequential amendment. Alternative viewshafts have been suggested.</p> <p>HBAL request that the description of Te Whanganui-a-Orotū Special landscape Character is amended to more closely reflect the area's present character, and as modified by the Airport. The Isthmus Napier Landscape Study recognises that the area is not natural enough to be considered 'Outstanding' and that the Airport is an area of greater development intensity.</p> <p>HBAL consider that the Special Landscape Control Areas and associated rule AIRPZ-R9 are unnecessary and should be deleted. Issues, objectives and</p>	Delete AIRPZ-AC7.	Open Submission



# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Assessment criteria /AIRPZ-AC8: Development in View Shaft Control Area.	Ellen Robotham	198.106	Oppose	<p>The Proposed Plan includes a number of mechanisms to protect landscape values within the Airport Zone including the Special Landscape Overlay, Viewshafts, and two Sensitive Landscape Control Areas.</p> <p>The approach as notified, does not provide clear guidance to plan users regarding the types of activities that are appropriate within these areas, and duplicates matters which are already accounted for in the main rule framework. HBAL recommend the landscape management framework in the Airport Zone is amended to remove duplication and provide for activities of appropriate scale as permitted activities.</p> <p>An assessment undertaken by Wayfinder (refer Appendix 3 of full submission), concludes some limitations of the viewshafts identified and have made a number of recommendations. As a result, HBAL request that the proposed viewshafts are deleted and all provisions in the Airport Zone relating to viewshafts are also deleted as a consequential amendment. Alternative viewshafts have been suggested.</p> <p>HBAL request that the description of Te Whanganui-a-Orotū Special landscape Character is amended to more closely reflect the area’s present character, and as modified by the Airport. The Isthmus Napier Landscape Study recognises that the area is not natural enough to be considered ‘Outstanding’ and that the Airport is an area of greater development intensity.</p> <p>HBAL consider that the Special Landscape Control Areas and associated rule AIRPZ-R9 are unnecessary and should be deleted. Issues, objectives and</p>	Delete AIRPZ-AC8.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Rules Table /AIRPZ-R1: Airport related activities AIRPZ-R1A.	Ellen Robotham	198.118	Amend	<p>Explanation as to the reasons for the requested changes can be found in the full submission. The provisions of the Airport Zone chapter need to be amended to provide for the Aeropark Master Plan development aspirations coupled with appropriate controls to ensure effects are managed. Modern airports often provide a wide range of services and land uses including commercial, industrial and logistical, as such services either provide direct servicing to the aviation industry or feed off it. Case law supports this range of services and land uses and notes that these are not necessarily connected to the arrival and departure of passengers. The distinction the PDP makes between Airport activity and Airport-related activity is not necessary as the activities undertaken are the same regardless of who undertakes the activity.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>AIRPZ-R1: Airport <del>related</del> activities</p> <p>AIRPZ-R1A Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where: Compliance with Standards AIRPZ-S1 - AIRPZ-S8.</p> <p><del>e. AIRPZ-AC5;</del></p> <p><del>d. AIRPZ-AC4, and</del></p> <p><del>c. AIRPZ-AC3;</del></p> <p><del>b. AIRPZ-AC2;</del></p> <p><del>a. AIRPZ-AC1;</del></p> <p>1. <u>The relevant matters of discretion for the standard/s infringed. Purpose of the standard(s), and</u></p> <p>AIRPZ-R1B Activity Status where compliance with activity condition AIRPZ-R1A.1a is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary</p>	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Rules Table /AIRPZ-R3: Cafes located outside the terminal buildings within the Airport Business Precinct.	Ellen Robotham	198.119	Amend	Explanation as to the reasons for the requested changes can be found in the full submission. The provisions of the Airport Zone chapter need to be amended to provide for the Aeropark Master Plan development aspirations coupled with appropriate controls to ensure effects are managed. Modern airports often provide a wide range of services and land uses including commercial, industrial and logistical, as such services either provide direct servicing to the aviation industry or feed off it. Case law supports this range of services and land uses and notes that these are not necessarily connected to the arrival and departure of passengers. The distinction the PDP makes between Airport activity and Airport-related activity is not necessary as the activities undertaken are the same regardless of who undertakes the activity. Economic evidence supports that a number of activities can occur onsite without negatively impacting on the economic integrity of established commercial areas. The Airport Business Precinct is referred to within the rule but this area is not mapped. It is requested that this area is mapped. Rule references and numbering contain errors and need to be amended to ensure accuracy. Matters of discretion for each rule are repetitive and unnecessary, with some needing to be more focused. The Non-Complying Activity status where certain conditions are not met is opposed and requested to be Discretionary instead.	Amend as follows:  AIRPZ-R3: Cafes located outside the terminal buildings within the Airport Business Precinct Activity Status: Permitted  AIRPZ-R3A Where: <del>1. There is no more than one cafe within the Airport Zone, excluding any cafes located within the terminal buildings;</del> <del>2. The café has a gross floor area less than 150 m2; and</del> <del>3. Compliance with Standards AIRPZ-S21 - AIRPZ-S78; and</del> <del>4. Compliance with Standard S1.</del> AIRPZ-R3B  Activity Status where compliance with condition AIRPZ-R3A.1, .2 and .3.4 is not achieved: Matters of discretion are: 1. <u>The relevant matters of discretion for the standard/s infringed. Purpose of the standard(s), and</u>  2. Assessment criteria: <del>a. AIRPZ-AC1;</del> <del>b. AIRPZ-AC2;</del> <del>c. AIRPZ-AC3;</del>	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Rules Table /AIRPZ-R4: Light manufacturing and servicing (and ancillary retailing) within the Airport Business Precinct.	Ellen Robotham	198.120	Amend	Explanation as to the reasons for the requested changes can be found in the full submission. The provisions of the Airport Zone chapter need to be amended to provide for the Aeropark Master Plan development aspirations coupled with appropriate controls to ensure effects are managed. Modern airports often provide a wide range of services and land uses including commercial, industrial and logistical, as such services either provide direct servicing to the aviation industry or feed off it. Case law supports this range of services and land uses and notes that these are not necessarily connected to the arrival and departure of passengers. The distinction the PDP makes between Airport activity and Airport-related activity is not necessary as the activities undertaken are the same regardless of who undertakes the activity. Economic evidence supports that a number of activities can occur onsite without negatively impacting on the economic integrity of established commercial areas. The Airport Business Precinct is referred to within the rule but this area is not mapped. It is requested that this area is mapped. Rule references and numbering contain errors and need to be amended to ensure accuracy. Matters of discretion for each rule are repetitive and unnecessary, with some needing to be more focused. The Non-Complying Activity status where certain conditions are not met is opposed and requested to be Discretionary instead.	Amend as follows:  AIRPZ-R4: Light manufacturing and servicing (and ancillary retailing or office) within the Airport Business Precinct  AIRPZ-R4A Activity Status: <del>Restricted Discretionary</del> Permitted  Where:  1. Retailing is limited to: a. goods or services manufactured, processed, repaired, or serviced on the site, and b. a maximum of 35% of the gross floor area of the building. 2. Compliance with Standards AIRPZ-S21-AIRPZ-S78; and 3. Compliance with Standard S1. <del>Matters of discretion are:</del> <del>1. Assessment criteria AIRPZ-AC6</del>  Matters of discretion are:  1. <u>The relevant matters of discretion for the standard/s infringed. Purpose of the standard(s), and</u> 2. Assessment criteria:	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Rules Table /AIRPZ-R5: Warehousing, transport depots (excluding for livestock or logging freight), and vehicle sales (and ancillary retailing or office) within the Airport Business Precinct.	Ellen Robotham	198.121	Amend	Explanation as to the reasons for the requested changes can be found in the full submission. The provisions of the Airport Zone chapter need to be amended to provide for the Aeropark Master Plan development aspirations coupled with appropriate controls to ensure effects are managed. Modern airports often provide a wide range of services and land uses including commercial, industrial and logistical, as such services either provide direct servicing to the aviation industry or feed off it. Case law supports this range of services and land uses and notes that these are not necessarily connected to the arrival and departure of passengers. The distinction the PDP makes between Airport activity and Airport-related activity is not necessary as the activities undertaken are the same regardless of who undertakes the activity. Economic evidence supports that a number of activities can occur onsite without negatively impacting on the economic integrity of established commercial areas. The Airport Business Precinct is referred to within the rule but this area is not mapped. It is requested that this area is mapped. Rule references and numbering contain errors and need to be amended to ensure accuracy. Matters of discretion for each rule are repetitive and unnecessary, with some needing to be more focused. The Non-Complying Activity status where certain conditions are not met is opposed and requested to be Discretionary instead.	Amend as follows:  AIRPZ-R5: Warehousing, transport depots (excluding for livestock or logging freight), and vehicle sales (and ancillary retailing or office) within the Airport Business Precinct  AIRPZ-R5A Activity Status: <del>Restricted Discretionary</del> Permitted Where:  1. Retailing is limited to: a. goods or services manufactured, processed, repaired or serviced on the site, and b. a maximum of 35% of the gross floor area of the building. 2. Office is limited to: a. the office gross floor area does not exceed 30% of all buildings on the site, or b. the office gross floor area does not exceed 100 m2 3. Compliance with Standards AIRPZ-S2 - AIRPZ-S68  <del>Matters of discretion are:</del>  1. <del>Assessment criteria AIRPZ-AC6</del>  AIRPZ-R5B Activity Status where compliance with condition AIRPZ-R5A.1, 2 and 3-a is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Rules Table /AIRPZ-R6: Research and innovation activities (and ancillary retailing) within the Airport Business Precinct.	Ellen Robotham	198.122		Explanation as to the reasons for the requested changes can be found in the full submission. The provisions of the Airport Zone chapter need to be amended to provide for the Aeropark Master Plan development aspirations coupled with appropriate controls to ensure effects are managed. Modern airports often provide a wide range of services and land uses including commercial, industrial and logistical, as such services either provide direct servicing to the aviation industry or feed off it. Case law supports this range of services and land uses and notes that these are not necessarily connected to the arrival and departure of passengers. The distinction the PDP makes between Airport activity and Airport-related activity is not necessary as the activities undertaken are the same regardless of who undertakes the activity. Economic evidence supports that a number of activities can occur onsite without negatively impacting on the economic integrity of established commercial areas. The Airport Business Precinct is referred to within the rule but this area is not mapped. It is requested that this area is mapped. Rule references and numbering contain errors and need to be amended to ensure accuracy. Matters of discretion for each rule are repetitive and unnecessary, with some needing to be more focused. The Non-Complying Activity status where certain conditions are not met is opposed and requested to be Discretionary instead.	Amend as follows:  AIRPZ-R6: Research and innovation activities (and ancillary retailing, <u>or office</u> ) within the Airport Business Precinct  AIRPZ-R6A Activity Status: <del>Restricted Discretionary</del> <u>Permitted</u> Where:  1. Retailing is limited to: a. goods or services manufactured, processed, repaired, or services on the site, and b. a maximum of 35% of the gross floor area of the building. 2. Compliance with Standards AIRPZ-S12 - AIRPZ-S78. 3. Compliance with Standard AIRPZ-S1.  <del>Matters of discretion are:</del>  a. <del>Assessment criteria AIRPZ-AC6.</del>  AIRPZ-R6B Activity Status where compliance with activity condition AIRPZ-	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Rules Table /General	Ellen Robotham	198.123	Amend	Explanation as to the reasons for the requested changes can be found in the full submission. The provisions of the Airport Zone chapter need to be amended to provide for the Aeropark Master Plan development aspirations coupled with appropriate controls to ensure effects are managed. Modern airports often provide a wide range of services and land uses including commercial, industrial and logistical, as such services either provide direct servicing to the aviation industry or feed off it. Case law supports this range of services and land uses and notes that these are not necessarily connected to the arrival and departure of passengers. The distinction the PDP makes between Airport activity and Airport-related activity is not necessary as the activities undertaken are the same regardless of who undertakes the activity. Economic evidence supports that a number of activities can occur onsite without negatively impacting on the economic integrity of established commercial areas. The Airport Business Precinct is referred to within the rule but this area is not mapped. It is requested that this area is mapped. Rule references and numbering contain errors and need to be amended to ensure accuracy. Matters of discretion for each rule are repetitive and unnecessary, with some needing to be more focused. The Non-Complying Activity status where certain conditions are not met is opposed and requested to be Discretionary instead.	<p>Add new rules:</p> <p><u>AIRPZ- R7: Office accommodation in the Airport Business Precinct not provided for as an ancillary activity</u></p> <p><u>AIRPZ-R7A</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status: Permitted Where:</u></p> <p><u>1. The office accommodation relates to:</u></p> <p><u>a. logistics, export, and rural activities not located on site, or</u></p> <p><u>b. flexible and co-working spaces.</u></p> <p><u>2. Compliance with Standards AIRPZ-S2 - AIRPZ-S8.</u></p> <p><u>3. Compliance with Standard AIRPZ-S1.</u></p> <p><u>AIRPZ-R7B</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status where compliance with AIRPZ-RXA.1 and .2 is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u></p> <p><u>1. The relevant matters of discretion for the standard/s infringed.</u></p> <p><u>2. AIRPZ-AC6.</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status where compliance with condition AIRPZ-</u></p>	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Rules Table /General	Ellen Robotham	198.124	Amend	Explanation as to the reasons for the requested changes can be found in the full submission. The provisions of the Airport Zone chapter need to be amended to provide for the Aeropark Master Plan development aspirations coupled with appropriate controls to ensure effects are managed. Modern airports often provide a wide range of services and land uses including commercial, industrial and logistical, as such services either provide direct servicing to the aviation industry or feed off it. Case law supports this range of services and land uses and notes that these are not necessarily connected to the arrival and departure of passengers. The distinction the PDP makes between Airport activity and Airport-related activity is not necessary as the activities undertaken are the same regardless of who undertakes the activity. Economic evidence supports that a number of activities can occur onsite without negatively impacting on the economic integrity of established commercial areas. The Airport Business Precinct is referred to within the rule but this area is not mapped. It is requested that this area is mapped. Rule references and numbering contain errors and need to be amended to ensure accuracy. Matters of discretion for each rule are repetitive and unnecessary, with some needing to be more focused. The Non-Complying Activity status where certain conditions are not met is opposed and requested to be Discretionary instead.	<p>Add new rule:</p> <p>AIRPZ-R8: Supermarkets in the Airport Business Precinct</p> <p>AIRPZ-R7A</p> <p>Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>1. The office accommodation relates to:</p> <p>a. logistics, export, and rural activities not located on site, or</p> <p>b. flexible and co-working spaces.</p> <p>2. Compliance with Standards AIRPZ-S2 - AIRPZ-S8.</p> <p>3. Compliance with Standard AIRPZ-S1.</p> <p>AIRPZ-R8B</p> <p>Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p>	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Rules Table /General	Ellen Robotham	198.125	Amend	Explanation as to the reasons for the requested changes can be found in the full submission. The provisions of the Airport Zone chapter need to be amended to provide for the Aeropark Master Plan development aspirations coupled with appropriate controls to ensure effects are managed. Modern airports often provide a wide range of services and land uses including commercial, industrial and logistical, as such services either provide direct servicing to the aviation industry or feed off it. Case law supports this range of services and land uses and notes that these are not necessarily connected to the arrival and departure of passengers. The distinction the PDP makes between Airport activity and Airport-related activity is not necessary as the activities undertaken are the same regardless of who undertakes the activity. Economic evidence supports that a number of activities can occur onsite without negatively impacting on the economic integrity of established commercial areas. The Airport Business Precinct is referred to within the rule but this area is not mapped. It is requested that this area is mapped. Rule references and numbering contain errors and need to be amended to ensure accuracy. Matters of discretion for each rule are repetitive and unnecessary, with some needing to be more focused. The Non-Complying Activity status where certain conditions are not met is opposed and requested to be Discretionary instead.	<p>Add new rule:</p> <p><u>AIRPZ-R9: Community Facilities in the Airport Business Precinct</u></p> <p><u>AIRPZ-R9A</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status: Permitted</u></p> <p>Where:</p> <p>1. <u>The activity does not include any Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise.</u></p> <p>2. <u>Compliance with Standards AIRPZ-S2 - AIRPZ-S8.</u></p> <p><u>AIRPZ-R9B</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status where compliance with AIRPZ-R10A.1 is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u></p> <p>1. <u>The relevant matters of discretion for the standard/s infringed.</u></p> <p>2. <u>AIRPZ-AC6.</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status where compliance with AIRPZ-R10A.2 is not</u></p>	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Rules Table /General	Ellen Robotham	198.126	Amend	Explanation as to the reasons for the requested changes can be found in the full submission. The provisions of the Airport Zone chapter need to be amended to provide for the Aeropark Master Plan development aspirations coupled with appropriate controls to ensure effects are managed. Modern airports often provide a wide range of services and land uses including commercial, industrial and logistical, as such services either provide direct servicing to the aviation industry or feed off it. Case law supports this range of services and land uses and notes that these are not necessarily connected to the arrival and departure of passengers. The distinction the PDP makes between Airport activity and Airport-related activity is not necessary as the activities undertaken are the same regardless of who undertakes the activity. Economic evidence supports that a number of activities can occur onsite without negatively impacting on the economic integrity of established commercial areas. The Airport Business Precinct is referred to within the rule but this area is not mapped. It is requested that this area is mapped. Rule references and numbering contain errors and need to be amended to ensure accuracy. Matters of discretion for each rule are repetitive and unnecessary, with some needing to be more focused. The Non-Complying Activity status where certain conditions are not met is opposed and requested to be Discretionary instead.	<p>Add new rule:</p> <p><u>AIRPZ-R10: Hotel and Conference Centre in the Airport Business Precinct</u></p> <p><u>AIRPZ-R10A</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p>Where:</p> <p>1. <u>The activity does not include any Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise.</u></p> <p>2. <u>Compliance with Standards AIRPZ-S2 - AIRPZ-S8.</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u></p> <p>1. <u>AIRPZ-AC6</u></p> <p>2. <u>Duration of stay of guests</u></p> <p>3. <u>Acoustic treatment</u></p> <p>4. <u>Building design and layout</u></p> <p><u>AIRPZ-R10B</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status: Discretionary</u></p>	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Rules Table /AIRPZ-R7: Activities not otherwise provided for (including all retailing, commercial, and industrial activities not otherwise provided for in AIRPZ-R5 to AIRPZ-R6)	Ellen Robotham	198.127	Amend	Explanation as to the reasons for the requested changes can be found in the full submission. The provisions of the Airport Zone chapter need to be amended to provide for the Aeropark Master Plan development aspirations coupled with appropriate controls to ensure effects are managed. Modern airports often provide a wide range of services and land uses including commercial, industrial and logistical, as such services either provide direct servicing to the aviation industry or feed off it. Case law supports this range of services and land uses and notes that these are not necessarily connected to the arrival and departure of passengers. The distinction the PDP makes between Airport activity and Airport-related activity is not necessary as the activities undertaken are the same regardless of who undertakes the activity. Economic evidence supports that a number of activities can occur onsite without negatively impacting on the economic integrity of established commercial areas. The Airport Business Precinct is referred to within the rule but this area is not mapped. It is requested that this area is mapped. Rule references and numbering contain errors and need to be amended to ensure accuracy. Matters of discretion for each rule are repetitive and unnecessary, with some needing to be more focused. The Non-Complying Activity status where certain conditions are not met is opposed and requested to be Discretionary instead.	Add new rules - amend:  AIRPZ- <del>R7-R11</del> : Activities not otherwise provided for <del>(including all retailing, commercial, and industrial activities not otherwise provided for in AIRPZ-R5 to AIRPZ-R6)</del>  Activity Status: <del>Non-complying</del> <u>Discretionary</u>	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Standards Table /AIRPZ-S1: Overall site coverage threshold in the Airport Business Precinct.	Ellen Robotham	198.128	Amend	Explanation as to the reasons for the requested changes can be found in the full submission. The provisions of the Airport Zone chapter need to be amended to provide for the Aeropark Master Plan development aspirations coupled with appropriate controls to ensure effects are managed. Modern airports often provide a wide range of services and land uses including commercial, industrial and logistical, as such services either provide direct servicing to the aviation industry or feed off it. Case law supports this range of services and land uses and notes that these are not necessarily connected to the arrival and departure of passengers. The distinction the PDP makes between Airport activity and Airport-related activity is not necessary as the activities undertaken are the same regardless of who undertakes the activity. Economic evidence supports that a number of activities can occur onsite without negatively impacting on the economic integrity of established commercial areas. The Airport Business Precinct is referred to within the rule but this area is not mapped. It is requested that this area is mapped. Rule references and numbering contain errors and need to be amended to ensure accuracy. Matters of discretion for each rule are repetitive and unnecessary, with some needing to be more focused. The Non-Complying Activity status where certain conditions are not met is opposed and requested to be Discretionary instead.	AMEND RULE:  AIRPZ-S1: Overall <del>site</del> <u>building</u> coverage threshold in the Airport Business Precinct  Purpose: to maintain the character, landscape, and cultural values of the northern entrance to the city while enabling development that can accommodate activities appropriate in the Airport Zone <del>as well as reduce dominating impacts on adjacent activities and ecological habitats and managing adverse effects on adjacent wetland areas.</del>  1. The maximum percentage of site area covered by buildings across the Airport Business Precinct shall be 65%.  Activity Status where standards are not met: Discretionary  Matters of discretion are: <del>NA</del> <u>1. Purpose of the Standard;</u> <u>2. Function and operation of the Airport;</u> <u>3. Effects on indigenous biodiversity values of adjacent wetlands</u> <u>4. Identified values of the Te Whanganui-a-Orotū Special Landscape Character;</u> <u>5. Cultural values;and</u> <u>6. AIRPZ-AC6.</u>	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Standards Table /AIRPZ-S2: General height control.	Ellen Robotham	198.129	Amend	Explanation as to the reasons for the requested changes can be found in the full submission. The provisions of the Airport Zone chapter need to be amended to provide for the Aeropark Master Plan development aspirations coupled with appropriate controls to ensure effects are managed. Modern airports often provide a wide range of services and land uses including commercial, industrial and logistical, as such services either provide direct servicing to the aviation industry or feed off it. Case law supports this range of services and land uses and notes that these are not necessarily connected to the arrival and departure of passengers. The distinction the PDP makes between Airport activity and Airport-related activity is not necessary as the activities undertaken are the same regardless of who undertakes the activity. Economic evidence supports that a number of activities can occur onsite without negatively impacting on the economic integrity of established commercial areas. The Airport Business Precinct is referred to within the rule but this area is not mapped. It is requested that this area is mapped. Rule references and numbering contain errors and need to be amended to ensure accuracy. Matters of discretion for each rule are repetitive and unnecessary, with some needing to be more focused. The Non-Complying Activity status where certain conditions are not met is opposed and requested to be Discretionary instead.	<p>AIRPZ-S2: General height control</p> <p>Purpose: to maintain the character, amenity, landscape, and cultural values of the northern entrance to the city while enabling development that can accommodate activities appropriate in the Airport Zone.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any part of a building or structure must not exceed 12 m in height.</li> <li>Standard AIRPZ-S2.1 does not apply to solar panels and solar heating devices ancillary to an existing building and where they do not exceed the height limit in Standard AIRPZ-S2.1 by more than 0.5 m measured vertically.</li> </ol> <p><del>Activity Status where standards are not met: Restricted-Discretionary</del></p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Purpose of the Standard;</li> <li>Function of the Airport Zone;</li> <li><del>Effects on amenity values, and</del></li> <li>Landscape and cultural values; <u>and</u></li> <li><u>AIRPZ-AC1</u></li> </ol>	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Standards Table /AIRPZ-S3: Height in relation to boundary.	Ellen Robotham	198.130	Amend	Explanation as to the reasons for the requested changes can be found in the full submission. The provisions of the Airport Zone chapter need to be amended to provide for the Aeropark Master Plan development aspirations coupled with appropriate controls to ensure effects are managed. Modern airports often provide a wide range of services and land uses including commercial, industrial and logistical, as such services either provide direct servicing to the aviation industry or feed off it. Case law supports this range of services and land uses and notes that these are not necessarily connected to the arrival and departure of passengers. The distinction the PDP makes between Airport activity and Airport-related activity is not necessary as the activities undertaken are the same regardless of who undertakes the activity. Economic evidence supports that a number of activities can occur onsite without negatively impacting on the economic integrity of established commercial areas. The Airport Business Precinct is referred to within the rule but this area is not mapped. It is requested that this area is mapped. Rule references and numbering contain errors and need to be amended to ensure accuracy. Matters of discretion for each rule are repetitive and unnecessary, with some needing to be more focused. The Non-Complying Activity status where certain conditions are not met is opposed and requested to be Discretionary instead.	<p>Delete standard:</p> <p><del>AIRPZ-S3: Height in relation to boundary</del></p> <p><del>Purpose: to maintain the character, landscape, and cultural values of the northern entrance to the city while enabling development that can accommodate activities appropriate in the Airport Zone as well as reduce dominating impacts on adjacent activities.</del></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>Any part of a building or structure must not project beyond a building envelope constructed by drawing planes along all parts of all airport zone boundaries. The planes must commence at 3 m above ground level at the zone boundary and must be inclined at the horizontal at an angle of 45 degrees.</del></li> <li><del>Standard AIRPZ-S3.1 does not apply to antennas, aerials, satellite dishes (less than 1 m in diameter), flues, flag poles, and chimneys no more than 1 m wide in any horizontal direction and less than 2.5 m in height beyond the building envelope.</del></li> <li><del>Standard AIRPZ-S3.1 does not apply to solar panels and solar heating devices where they do not exceed the height limit in Standard AIRPZ-S2.1 by more than 0.5 m measured vertically.</del></li> </ol> <p><del>Activity Status where standards are not met: Restricted-Discretionary</del></p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p>	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Standards Table /AIRPZ-S4: Yards.	Ellen Robotham	198.131	Amend	Explanation as to the reasons for the requested changes can be found in the full submission. The provisions of the Airport Zone chapter need to be amended to provide for the Aeropark Master Plan development aspirations coupled with appropriate controls to ensure effects are managed. Modern airports often provide a wide range of services and land uses including commercial, industrial and logistical, as such services either provide direct servicing to the aviation industry or feed off it. Case law supports this range of services and land uses and notes that these are not necessarily connected to the arrival and departure of passengers. The distinction the PDP makes between Airport activity and Airport-related activity is not necessary as the activities undertaken are the same regardless of who undertakes the activity. Economic evidence supports that a number of activities can occur onsite without negatively impacting on the economic integrity of established commercial areas. The Airport Business Precinct is referred to within the rule but this area is not mapped. It is requested that this area is mapped. Rule references and numbering contain errors and need to be amended to ensure accuracy. Matters of discretion for each rule are repetitive and unnecessary, with some needing to be more focused. The Non-Complying Activity status where certain conditions are not met is opposed and requested to be Discretionary instead.	Amend as follows:  AIRPZ-S4: Yards  Purpose: to maintain amenity to surrounding zones while recognising the functional and operational requirements of the airport.  1. Any part of a building (including eaves and guttering) must not be erected closer than 5 m to any other zone boundary. 2. Standards AIRPZ-S4.1 and AIRPZ-S4.2 does not apply to security fencing around the perimeter of the airport or fencing required to ensure compliance with civil aviation regulations.  <del>Activity Status where standards are not met: Restricted-Discretionary</del>  Matters of discretion are:  1.Purpose of the standard; 2.Function <u>and operation</u> of the Airport Zone; 3.Effects on amenity values; 4.Landscape and cultural values; 5.Effects of shading, and 6.Effects of dominance on <del>the streetscape</del> , adjacent zones; and 7.AIRPZ-AC2.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Standards Table /AIRPZ-S5: Outdoor storage (including refuse storage).	Ellen Robotham	198.132	Amend	Explanation as to the reasons for the requested changes can be found in the full submission. The provisions of the Airport Zone chapter need to be amended to provide for the Aeropark Master Plan development aspirations coupled with appropriate controls to ensure effects are managed. Modern airports often provide a wide range of services and land uses including commercial, industrial and logistical, as such services either provide direct servicing to the aviation industry or feed off it. Case law supports this range of services and land uses and notes that these are not necessarily connected to the arrival and departure of passengers. The distinction the PDP makes between Airport activity and Airport-related activity is not necessary as the activities undertaken are the same regardless of who undertakes the activity. Economic evidence supports that a number of activities can occur onsite without negatively impacting on the economic integrity of established commercial areas. The Airport Business Precinct is referred to within the rule but this area is not mapped. It is requested that this area is mapped. Rule references and numbering contain errors and need to be amended to ensure accuracy. Matters of discretion for each rule are repetitive and unnecessary, with some needing to be more focused. The Non-Complying Activity status where certain conditions are not met is opposed and requested to be Discretionary instead.	Amend as follows:  <del>Activity Status where standards are not met: Restricted-Discretionary</del>  Matters of discretion are:  1.Purpose of the standard; 2.Function <u>and operation</u> of the Airport Zone; 3.Effects on amenity values, <del>and</del> 4.Landscape and cultural values; and 5.AIRPZ-AC3	Open Submission



# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Standards Table /AIRPZ-S6: Fences and walls.	Ellen Robotham	198.133	Amend	Explanation as to the reasons for the requested changes can be found in the full submission. The provisions of the Airport Zone chapter need to be amended to provide for the Aeropark Master Plan development aspirations coupled with appropriate controls to ensure effects are managed. Modern airports often provide a wide range of services and land uses including commercial, industrial and logistical, as such services either provide direct servicing to the aviation industry or feed off it. Case law supports this range of services and land uses and notes that these are not necessarily connected to the arrival and departure of passengers. The distinction the PDP makes between Airport activity and Airport-related activity is not necessary as the activities undertaken are the same regardless of who undertakes the activity. Economic evidence supports that a number of activities can occur onsite without negatively impacting on the economic integrity of established commercial areas. The Airport Business Precinct is referred to within the rule but this area is not mapped. It is requested that this area is mapped. Rule references and numbering contain errors and need to be amended to ensure accuracy. Matters of discretion for each rule are repetitive and unnecessary, with some needing to be more focused. The Non-Complying Activity status where certain conditions are not met is opposed and requested to be Discretionary instead.	Amend as follows: <del>Activity Status where standards are not met: Restricted-Discretionary</del>  Matters of discretion are: 1. Purpose of the standard; 2. Function <u>and operation</u> of the Airport-Zone; 3. Effects on amenity values, <del>and</del> 4. The positive effects of fences to mitigate visual and noise effects of nearby land uses; and 5. AIRPZ-AC4	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Standards Table /AIRPZ-S7: Landscaping.	Ellen Robotham	198.134	Amend	Explanation as to the reasons for the requested changes can be found in the full submission. The provisions of the Airport Zone chapter need to be amended to provide for the Aeropark Master Plan development aspirations coupled with appropriate controls to ensure effects are managed. Modern airports often provide a wide range of services and land uses including commercial, industrial and logistical, as such services either provide direct servicing to the aviation industry or feed off it. Case law supports this range of services and land uses and notes that these are not necessarily connected to the arrival and departure of passengers. The distinction the PDP makes between Airport activity and Airport-related activity is not necessary as the activities undertaken are the same regardless of who undertakes the activity. Economic evidence supports that a number of activities can occur onsite without negatively impacting on the economic integrity of established commercial areas. The Airport Business Precinct is referred to within the rule but this area is not mapped. It is requested that this area is mapped. Rule references and numbering contain errors and need to be amended to ensure accuracy. Matters of discretion for each rule are repetitive and unnecessary, with some needing to be more focused. The Non-Complying Activity status where certain conditions are not met is opposed and requested to be Discretionary instead.	Amend as follows: AIRPZ-S7: Landscaping  Purpose: to provide for an attractive gateway to the city reflective of the role and function of the airport and its setting within the landscape known as Te Whanganui-a-Orotū, and to ensure the visual effects of buildings and activities are mitigated.  <del>1. Any new development shall provide a minimum 2-metre wide landscape planting strip between any car parking area, loading bay, service area or building and the Airport Link Road.</del> 2. Where any car parking area, loading area, or building is constructed on any site adjacent to the Watchman Road Reserve, a minimum 3-metre-wide landscape planting strip shall be provided along the legal boundary of the site comprising indigenous species. The planting shall include feature trees at 15 m spacing of a minimum height of 2 m at the time of planting. 3. The planting required by 1 <del>and 2</del> above shall be undertaken within the first planting season of the commencement of the construction of the building or development and shall be maintained on an ongoing basis. Any plants or trees that die shall be replaced within the next growing season.  <del>Activity Status where standards are not met: Restricted-Discretionary</del>  Matters of discretion are restricted to:	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Standards Table /General	Ellen Robotham	198.135	Amend	Explanation as to the reasons for the requested changes can be found in the full submission. The provisions of the Airport Zone chapter need to be amended to provide for the Aeropark Master Plan development aspirations coupled with appropriate controls to ensure effects are managed. Modern airports often provide a wide range of services and land uses including commercial, industrial and logistical, as such services either provide direct servicing to the aviation industry or feed off it. Case law supports this range of services and land uses and notes that these are not necessarily connected to the arrival and departure of passengers. The distinction the PDP makes between Airport activity and Airport-related activity is not necessary as the activities undertaken are the same regardless of who undertakes the activity. Economic evidence supports that a number of activities can occur onsite without negatively impacting on the economic integrity of established commercial areas. The Airport Business Precinct is referred to within the rule but this area is not mapped. It is requested that this area is mapped. Rule references and numbering contain errors and need to be amended to ensure accuracy. Matters of discretion for each rule are repetitive and unnecessary, with some needing to be more focused. The Non-Complying Activity status where certain conditions are not met is opposed and requested to be Discretionary instead.	Amend as follows: <u>AIRPZ-S8: Servicing</u>  <u>Purpose: to manage risk to human health and effects on water quality, ecology, and the council's reticulated network; to ensure development layout, operation and design do not contaminate water; to minimise potential flood risks; and to minimise effects on the capacity of the stormwater network.</u> – <u>1. Sites must not drain stormwater directly into Te Whanga (the Ahuriri estuary) or any waterbody.</u> <u>2. Interceptor traps must be used to remove sediment, floating debris, and oil products from all stormwater collected from the site, including general yards and storage areas, prior to any discharge to the Napier City Council reticulated stormwater system.</u> <u>3. New activities that require water must be connected to a public reticulated water supply where a supply is available.</u> <u>4. New activities that discharge wastewater must be connected to a public reticulated wastewater disposal system where a supply is available.</u>  <u>Note: Stormwater may only be discharged to a council-reticulated network in compliance with the Napier City Council Stormwater Bylaw.</u>	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Issues /AIRPZ-14: Compatibility of non-airport-related activities.	Georgina McPherson	215.166	Support	The Fuel Companies agree that managing reverse sensitivity effects is a key issue for the Airport Zone.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Objectives /AIRPZ-03: Management of environmental effects.  Relates to AIRPZ-13	Georgina McPherson	215.167	Support	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this objective and seek that it be retained.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Objectives /AIRPZ-04: Compatibility of activities with the airport operation.  Relates to AIRPZ-14	Georgina McPherson	215.168	Support	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this objective and seek that it be retained.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Policies /AIRPZ-P1: Airport operation and development.  Relates to AIRPZ-01, AIRPZ-04	Georgina McPherson	215.169	Support	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this policy and seek that it be retained.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Policies /AIRPZ-P5: Management of effects.  Relates to AIRPZ-03	Georgina McPherson	215.170	Support	The Fuel Companies support the intent of this policy and seek that it be retained.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Rules Table /AIRPZ-R1: Airport related activities.	Georgina McPherson	215.171	Support	AIRPZ-R1 applies to 'airport-related activities' which as defined in Part 1 includes "fuel installations and fuel servicing facilities" and "facilities for handling and storage of hazardous substances". This is supported by the Fuel Companies and seek that it be retained.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Objectives /AIRPZ-03: Management of environmental effects.  Relates to AIRPZ-13	Trevor Ellis	253.98	Support	Objective 3 gives effect to the NPS-IB 2023.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Objectives /AIRPZ-06: Special landscape character values - sensitive landscape control areas.  Relates to AIRPZ-15	Trevor Ellis	253.99	Support	Objective 6 gives effect to the NPS-IB 2023.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

# AIRPZ - Airport Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Policies /AIRPZ-P5: Management of effect.	Trevor Ellis	253.100	Amend	Considers that Policy 6 should be amended to ensure its wording is in line with Objective 3. The language used in Objective 3 is ensuring the Effects Management Hierarchy is used as per the requirements of the NPS-IB 2023.	Seeks to amend AIRPZ-P5 as follows: AIRPZ-P5: Management of effects Manage activity, building, and structure effects, having regard to: (...) 7. the effects of the activity on the ecologically sensitive Ahuriri Estuary, Watchman Road Reserve, and Westshore Wildlife Reserve are <u>avoided, remedied, or</u> minimised, and 8. whether the activity achieves a level of amenity reflective of its proximity to Ahuriri Estuary, Watchman Road Reserve, Westshore Wildlife Reserve, and Westshore residential area.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Policies /AIRPZ-P7: Special landscape character values - sensitive landscape control areas.  Relates to AIRPZ-O6	Trevor Ellis	253.101	Support	Supports as AIRPZ-P7 provides for sensitive landscape controls to protect the nearby Ahuriri Estuary and Public Conservation Land.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Policies /AIRPZ-P4: Airport built environment.  Relates to AIRPZ-O2	Nichola Nicholson	264.4	Amend	Supports in principle the proposed approach to imposing setbacks from ecologically sensitive areas. Non-airport activities that may appropriately be located outside of the terminal but within the Airport Zone should not be located within or impact on wetland areas with biodiversity values.	No relief sought. Retain as notified (Inferred).	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /Policies /AIRPZ-P7: Special landscape character values - sensitive landscape control areas.  Relates to AIRPZ-O6	Nichola Nicholson	264.5	Oppose	Oppose AIRPZ-P7 due to concerns around the encouragement of development within Sensitive Landscape Control Area 1 near Watchman Road Reserve	Delete AIRPZ-P7.	Open Submission
AIRPZ - Airport Zone /AIRPZ - Airport Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.95	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency's main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</p> <p>SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.</p> <p>In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and</p>	<p>To include a new performance standard as follows: <u>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</u></p> <p><u>1. All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u></p> <p><u>2. Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p><u>Matter of discretion:</u></p> <p><u>1. The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.</p>	Open Submission

# MIZ - Marine Industrial Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MIZ - Marine Industrial Zone /MIZ - Marine Industrial Zone - Standards Table /MIZ-S5: Fences	Susan Dallas	25.35	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.(Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
MIZ - Marine Industrial Zone /MIZ - Marine Industrial Zone - Standards Table /MIZ-S5: Fences	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.33	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
MIZ - Marine Industrial Zone	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.35	Oppose	The Marine Industry Zone applies to land subject to the Reserves Act and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. Making marine industry permitted does not necessarily give effect to the Reserves Management Plan or NZCPS. Some assessment of these activities through a resource consent process is appropriate. Further, non-marine industry activities may also be appropriate in this location. Marine industry such as boat building can also locate in other industrial zones; it is not essential they always have direct water access. The Boat Harbour Zone provisions are therefore appropriate to consider this balance of activities and potential impacts on the coastal environment.	Delete Marine Industry Zone in its entirety.	Open Submission
MIZ - Marine Industrial Zone /MIZ - Marine Industrial Zone - Standards Table /MIZ-S2: Height	Ryan Andrew Schnell	204.3	Oppose	Considers that when looking at any of the industrial areas it seems that the building height restrictions do not take into account some of the trends we are seeing in the international market places, who are facing similar issue to those we are experiencing. Due to the lack of available space in industrial areas, multi-level warehousing facilities are becoming more common and while the submitter does not have any current plans for such facilities it is something that they are exploring further.	Seeks for the maximum building height limit to be increased to allow for buildings higher than two storey.	Open Submission
MIZ - Marine Industrial Zone /Policies /MIZ-P3: Avoiding adverse effects on water margins and land with sensitive values	Trevor Ellis	253.102	Support	Supports as MIZ-P3 recognises the importance of protecting the CMA while undertaking marine industrial activities.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
MIZ - Marine Industrial Zone /MIZ - Marine Industrial Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.97	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency's main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</p> <p>SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.</p> <p>In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure and that new connections under the water supply bylaw will not be granted where there is insufficient capacity available within the water supply network for the proposed activity.</p>	<p>To include a new performance standard as follows:</p> <p><b>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</b></p> <p>1. All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</p> <p>2. Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</p> <p>Matter of discretion:</p> <p>1. The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.</p>	Open Submission

## MPZ - Maori Purpose Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MPZ - Maori Purpose Zone /MPZ - Maori Purpose Zone - Standards Table	Susan Dallas	25.36	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
MPZ - Maori Purpose Zone /MPZ - Maori Purpose Zone - Standards Table	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.34	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
MPZ - Maori Purpose Zone /Introduction	Sera Chambers	150.240	Oppose	opposes on the basis that the people of Napier should be allowed to enjoy their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their right to have their say on how a development may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated. In particular four of the areas listed, two are established low-lying liquefaction effected residential areas, one is located in a low-lying flood affected area and one is part of a reserve. Risks may need to be mitigated.	seeks to oppose provision on the basis that of four of the areas listed, two are established low-lying liquefaction effected residential areas, one is located in a low-lying flood affected area and one is part of a reserve. Risks may need to be mitigated.	Open Submission
MPZ - Maori Purpose Zone /MPZ - Maori Purpose Zone - Rules Table	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.97	Support	Supports educational facilities being permitted activity in the Māori Purpose Zone.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
MPZ - Maori Purpose Zone /Assessment criteria - Maori Purpose Zone /MPZ-AC1: All infringements	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.98	Amend	The Ministry request that any maximum capacity limits on educational facility are removed. Maximum capacity limits need to be assessed by the education provider. Effects associated with an increased number of students can be managed through other matters of discretion or assessment criteria to manage the specific effects of concern.	Seeks to amend as follows:  Education and services The extent to which adverse effects may be mitigated by imposing conditions on: i. hours of operation; ii. <del>maximum person capacity, and</del> iii. unreasonable noise.	Open Submission
MPZ - Maori Purpose Zone /Introduction /General	Development Nous Limited - Phil Stickney	280.12	Amend	The Submitter generally supports the proposed Introduction and the Issues framework (contained within MSPZ-I1 – MPS-I5 subject to amendments to the issues that capture the definition sought in this submission relating to a Māori Purpose Activity.	Amend the Introduction and Issues section to clearly reflect the nature of the activities captured within the Māori Purpose Activity definition.	Open Submission
MPZ - Maori Purpose Zone /Issues /General	Development Nous Limited - Phil Stickney	280.13		The Submitter generally supports the proposed Introduction and the Issues framework (contained within MSPZ-I1 – MPS-I5 subject to amendments to the issues that capture the definition sought in this submission relating to a Māori Purpose Activity.	Amend the Introduction and Issues section to clearly reflect the nature of the activities captured within the Māori Purpose Activity definition.	Open Submission
MPZ - Maori Purpose Zone /Policies /General	Development Nous Limited - Phil Stickney	280.14	Amend	The Submitter seeks an encompassing policy which captures the core intent of the activities listed whilst still placing the same obligations on those activities under the Act in respect of avoidance, mitigation and remediation.	Insert a new Policy in PKA-P section which reads:  Māori Purpose Activities and the comprehensive, coordinated and efficient development of land are enabled in the Māori Purpose Zone whilst ensuring actual or potentially adverse effects of activities are avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Open Submission
MPZ - Maori Purpose Zone /MPZ - Maori Purpose Zone - Rules Table /General	Development Nous Limited - Phil Stickney	280.15	Amend	The Submitter seeks to ensure that the range of activities provided for within the MPZ and to be amended as per the extent of the definition sought in this submission, are capable of enabling such activities subject to the reasonable consideration of the effects that may arise and the nature of amended or additional controls that may be required for their effects to be assessed, where it is reasonable to do so.	Amend the rules and standards to reflect a logical cascade of consenting status depending upon the nature of the activity enabled as part of a Māori Purpose Activity and appropriate matters for assessment.	Open Submission
MPZ - Maori Purpose Zone /MPZ - Maori Purpose Zone - Standards Table /General	Development Nous Limited - Phil Stickney	280.16	Amend	The Submitter seeks to ensure that the range of activities provided for within the MPZ and to be amended as per the extent of the definition sought in this submission, are capable of enabling such activities subject to the reasonable consideration of the effects that may arise and the nature of amended or additional controls that may be required for their effects to be assessed, where it is reasonable to do so.	Amend the rules and standards to reflect a logical cascade of consenting status depending upon the nature of the activity enabled as part of a Māori Purpose Activity and appropriate matters for assessment.	Open Submission

# MPZ - Maori Purpose Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MPZ - Maori Purpose Zone /MPZ - Maori Purpose Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.98	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency's main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</p> <p>SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB-S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.</p> <p>In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure and that new connections under the water supply bylaw will not be granted where there is insufficient capacity available within the water supply network for the proposed activity.</p>	<p>To include a new performance standard as follows:</p> <p><u>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</u></p> <p><u>1. All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u></p> <p><u>2. Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p><u>Matter of discretion:</u></p> <p><u>1. The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p>Or To similar effect. And any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.</p>	Open Submission

# PORTZ - Port Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PORTZ - Port Zone /Policies /PORTZ-P1: Regional significance of Napier Port	Sheena McGuire	168.125	Support	Notes that part of the rail corridor extends within the Port Zone. Supports policies that recognise and enable port and industrial activities, including freight activities and movements.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Policies /PORTZ-P2: Characteristics of port activities	Sheena McGuire	168.126	Support	Notes that part of the rail corridor extends within the Port Zone. Supports policies that recognise and enable port and industrial activities, including freight activities and movements.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Policies /PORTZ-P4: Port-related activities	Sheena McGuire	168.127	Support	Notes that part of the rail corridor extends within the Port Zone. Supports policies that recognise and enable port and industrial activities, including freight activities and movements.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /PORTZ - Port Zone - Rules Table /PORTZ-R1: Any port-related activities	Sheena McGuire	168.128	Support	Supports the permitted activity status of any port-related activities.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Objectives /PORTZ-O1: Provide for Napier Port	Mark Leggett	180.13	Support	Supports the proposed objectives and policies seek to address identified issues with the more generic operative provisions: i.e. that they overlook the unique operational needs of the Napier Port and do not include specific objectives and policies that provide for the nature and scale of the operations ensuring that the Port facilities are not constrained.Supports the more specific wording of the proposed objectives and policies as giving effect to NZCPS Policy 9 and to the Port's status as regionally significant infrastructure.	Retain provisions as notified.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Objectives /PORTZ-O2: The efficient and effective use and development of Napier Port	Mark Leggett	180.14	Support	Supports the proposed objectives and policies seek to address identified issues with the more generic operative provisions: i.e. that they overlook the unique operational needs of the Napier Port and do not include specific objectives and policies that provide for the nature and scale of the operations ensuring that the Port facilities are not constrained.Supports the more specific wording of the proposed objectives and policies as giving effect to NZCPS Policy 9 and to the Port's status as regionally significant infrastructure.	Retain provisions as notified.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Policies /PORTZ-P1: Regional significance of Napier Port	Mark Leggett	180.15	Support	Supports the proposed objectives and policies seek to address identified issues with the more generic operative provisions: i.e. that they overlook the unique operational needs of the Napier Port and do not include specific objectives and policies that provide for the nature and scale of the operations ensuring that the Port facilities are not constrained. Supports the more specific wording of the proposed objectives and policies as giving effect to NZCPS Policy 9 and to the Port's status as regionally significant infrastructure.	Retain provisions as notified.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Policies /PORTZ-P2: Characteristics of port activities	Mark Leggett	180.16	Support	Supports the proposed objectives and policies seek to address identified issues with the more generic operative provisions: i.e. that they overlook the unique operational needs of the Napier Port and do not include specific objectives and policies that provide for the nature and scale of the operations ensuring that the Port facilities are not constrained. Supports the more specific wording of the proposed objectives and policies as giving effect to NZCPS Policy 9 and to the Port's status as regionally significant infrastructure.	Retain provisions as notified.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Policies /PORTZ-P4: Port-related activities	Mark Leggett	180.17	Support	Supports as the proposed objectives and policies seek to address identified issues with the more generic operative provisions: i.e. that they overlook the unique operational needs of the Napier Port and do not include specific objectives and policies that provide for the nature and scale of the operations ensuring that the Port facilities are not constrained. Supports the more specific wording of the proposed objectives and policies as giving effect to NZCPS Policy 9 and to the Port's status as regionally significant infrastructure.	Retain provisions as notified.	Open Submission

# PORTZ - Port Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PORTZ - Port Zone /PORTZ - Port Zone - Rules Table /PORTZ-R4: Port-related industrial activity, transport, storage, and goods handling	Mark Leggett	180.18	Oppose	Opposes as 'Port-related industrial activity, transport, storage and goods handling' is provided for as a permitted activity in the PORTZ Zone, (with a default to fully discretionary activity in the event of infringements of relevant standards in the PORTZ Zone), however, the term is not defined in the PDP. Considers that the distinction between it and the definition for 'Port-related activity' is not clear. Considers that there is no justification for distinguishing between 'Port-related industrial activity' and general 'Industrial activity', which is defined, in the PORTZ Zone. 'Industrial activity' should be provided for as a permitted activity, enabling the PORTZ objectives and policies and relevant assessment criteria (including 'Whether the activity has an operational requirement to be located in the Port Zone') as notified brought to bear in instances where relevant PORTZ standards are infringed.Considers that it is not clear what activities the Assessment criteria PORTZ- AC5 are intended to apply to. It is not clear whether "Activities that are not directly related to the port activities" encompasses any activities not catered for under Rule PORTZ-R1 alone, or also PORTZ-R2 to PORTZ-R5. Seeks amendment to PORTZ-R4 above, to clarified that PORTZ-AC5 only applies with respect to activities subject to PORTZ-R5.	Amend Rule PORTZ-R4 to read:'PORTZ-R4: <del>Port-related industrial</del> Industrial activity, transport, storage and goods handling'	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Assessment criteria /PORTZ-AC3: Port-related industrial, transport, storage, and goods handling	Mark Leggett	180.19	Oppose	Opposes as 'Port-related industrial activity, transport, storage and goods handling' is provided for as a permitted activity in the PORTZ Zone, (with a default to fully discretionary activity in the event of infringements of relevant standards in the PORTZ Zone), however, the term is not defined in the PDP. Considers that the distinction between it and the definition for 'Port-related activity' is not clear. Considers that there is no justification for distinguishing between 'Port-related industrial activity' and general 'Industrial activity', which is defined, in the PORTZ Zone. 'Industrial activity' should be provided for as a permitted activity, enabling the PORTZ objectives and policies and relevant assessment criteria (including 'Whether the activity has an operational requirement to be located in the Port Zone') as notified brought to bear in instances where relevant PORTZ standards are infringed.Considers that it is not clear what activities the Assessment criteria PORTZ- AC5 are intended to apply to. It is not clear whether "Activities that are not directly related to the port activities" encompasses any activities not catered for under Rule PORTZ-R1 alone, or also PORTZ-R2 to PORTZ-R5. Seeks amendment to PORTZ-R4 above, to clarified that PORTZ-AC5 only applies with respect to activities subject to PORTZ-R5.	Amend Assessment criteria PORTZ-AC3 to read: 'PORTZ-AC3: <del>Port-related industrial</del> Industrial activity, transport, storage and goods handling' Delete Assessment criteria PORTZ-AC3a. relating to: ' <del>Whether the activity has an operational requirement to be located in the Port Zone.</del> '	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Assessment criteria /PORTZ-AC5: Activities that are not directly related to the port activities	Mark Leggett	180.20	Oppose	Opposes as 'Port-related industrial activity, transport, storage and goods handling' is provided for as a permitted activity in the PORTZ Zone, (with a default to fully discretionary activity in the event of infringements of relevant standards in the PORTZ Zone), however, the term is not defined in the PDP. Considers that the distinction between it and the definition for 'Port-related activity' is not clear. Considers that there is no justification for distinguishing between 'Port-related industrial activity' and general 'Industrial activity', which is defined, in the PORTZ Zone. 'Industrial activity' should be provided for as a permitted activity, enabling the PORTZ objectives and policies and relevant assessment criteria (including 'Whether the activity has an operational requirement to be located in the Port Zone') as notified brought to bear in instances where relevant PORTZ standards are infringed.Considers that it is not clear what activities the Assessment criteria PORTZ- AC5 are intended to apply to. It is not clear whether "Activities that are not directly related to the port activities" encompasses any activities not catered for under Rule PORTZ-R1 alone, or also PORTZ-R2 to PORTZ-R5. Seeks amendment to PORTZ-R4 above, to clarified that PORTZ-AC5 only applies with respect to activities subject to PORTZ-R5.	Amend Assessment criteria PORTZ-AC5 to read: 'PORTZ-AC5: Activities <del>that are not directly related to the port activities</del> <u>subject to PORTZ-R5</u> '	Open Submission



# PORTZ - Port Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PORTZ - Port Zone /PORTZ - Port Zone - Standards Table /PORTZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary	Mark Leggett	180.21	Oppose	Notes that standard PORTZ-S2 aims to maintain character and amenity of areas adjacent to the Port, including residential amenity. Considers that there is an over-extension of the standard's scope by referencing "site boundary" beyond its stated purpose. Considers that the standard does not apply with respect to the submitter's site (Lot 1 DP 13666) Considers that the application of the standard to sites within the PORTZ Zone is questionable given the functional, workaday appearance of the Port, the fact that the standard appears intent on managing the interface with other zones, and the reality that most sites at the Port have no legal road access. Request review and clarification of the rationale for Standard PORTZ-S2 to ensure its application aligns with intended objectives	Amend Standard PORTZ-S2 as follows: '2. No part of a building, structure, outdoor storage, refuse storage area or stockpile or stored goods must project beyond a building envelope constructed by drawing planes along all parts of all zone boundaries, other than the coastal marine area boundary. The planes must commence 7.5 m above ground level at the zone boundary <del>and at any site boundary adjoining a road or designated rail corridor</del> and must be inclined to the horizontal at an angle of 65 degrees. 3. This standard does not apply to lighting poles, quayside cranes, and container cranes <u>or to sites located in the PORTZ – Port Zone that do not have direct access to a legal road.</u> '	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Assessment criteria /PORTZ-AC1: All infringements	Mark Leggett	180.22	Oppose	Notes that standard PORTZ-S2 aims to maintain character and amenity of areas adjacent to the Port, including residential amenity. Considers that there is an over-extension of the standard's scope by referencing "site boundary" beyond its stated purpose. Considers that the standard does not apply with respect to the submitter's site (Lot 1 DP 13666) Considers that the application of the standard to sites within the PORTZ Zone is questionable given the functional, workaday appearance of the Port, the fact that the standard appears intent on managing the interface with other zones, and the reality that most sites at the Port have no legal road access. Request review and clarification of the rationale for Standard PORTZ-S2 to ensure its application aligns with intended objectives	Amend related matters of discretion and Assessment criteria PORTZ-AC1 to reflect a refocusing of the standard on the management of the PORTZ Zone's external interface and maintenance of the character and amenity of adjoining residential areas.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /PORTZ - Port Zone - Standards Table /PORTZ-S3: Site coverage	Mark Leggett	180.23	Oppose	Opposes as it is not clear why a limit on site coverage is sought to be imposed in the PORTZ Zone. Notes that the stated purpose of the rule is <i>'to provide for buildings that are functional and of a sufficient size to provide for a range of port-related activities; to manage the effects of buildings and structures on residential amenity and use of the coastal marine area and open spaces.'</i> Submitter questions the applicability of this standard to sites within PORTZ Zone due to the functional, industrial nature of the Port, its physical separation from residential areas, and the need to maximize space efficiency. Notes that no equivalent limitation on site coverage applies in the GIZ – General Industrial Zone, which exhibits a similar character to the Port. Considers that 100% coverage should be permissible in the circumstances and seeks the deletion of this standard.	Delete Standard PORTZ-S3.Delete associated Assessment criteria in PORTZ- AC1.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Assessment criteria /PORTZ-AC1: All infringements	Mark Leggett	180.24	Oppose	Opposes as it is not clear why a limit on site coverage is sought to be imposed in the PORTZ Zone. Notes that the stated purpose of the rule is <i>'to provide for buildings that are functional and of a sufficient size to provide for a range of port-related activities; to manage the effects of buildings and structures on residential amenity and use of the coastal marine area and open spaces.'</i> Submitter questions the applicability of this standard to sites within PORTZ Zone due to the functional, industrial nature of the Port, its physical separation from residential areas, and the need to maximize space efficiency. Notes that no equivalent limitation on site coverage applies in the GIZ – General Industrial Zone, which exhibits a similar character to the Port. Considers that 100% coverage should be permissible in the circumstances and seeks the deletion of this standard.	Delete Standard PORTZ-S3.Delete associated Assessment criteria in PORTZ- AC1.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Introduction	Alan Petersen	187.32	Amend	The land area is largely reclaimed from the sea. The activities at the port cross the boundary of the Coastal Marine Area (CMA) and good connections to major land transport routes by road and rail are essential. Port activities have unique characteristics, with adverse effects on surrounding areas that include visual, noise, <del>and</del> transport effects, <u>and light spill.</u>	Submission 31 - 4th paragraph – add light spill.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Issues /PORTZ-11: Regional significance of Napier Port	Alan Petersen	187.33	Amend	Submission 32 – Add to the regional "and from further afield" --.	Add to the regional <u>"and from further afield"</u> --.	Open Submission

# PORTZ - Port Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PORTZ - Port Zone /Issues /PORTZ-I2: Amenity values in the surrounding environment	Alan Petersen	187.34	Amend	Submission 33 – Has the Port on its current site been there since 1880s? I understand the current site was established after the 1931 Earthquake. Please amend to the correct year. Also add that the residential environment was established in the 1860s. It could have been even earlier.	Submission 33 – Has the Port on its current site been there since 1880s? I understand the current site was established after the 1931 Earthquake. Please amend to the correct year. Also add that the residential environment was established in the 1860s. It could have been even earlier.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Assessment criteria /PORTZ-AC1: All infringements	Alan Petersen	187.35	Support	Support all the assessment matters where any development must consider the neighbouring areas – including residential and recreational.	Support all the assessment matters where any development must consider the neighbouring areas – including residential and recreational.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Assessment criteria /PORTZ-AC5: Activities that are not directly related to the port activities	Alan Petersen	187.36	Oppose	Its interesting that the road & rail networks between the Port site and the residential environment have much lower noise limits than the Port is proposing.	Its interesting that the road & rail networks between the Port site and the residential environment have much lower noise limits than the Port is proposing.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /General /General	Grant Russell	202.1	Support	(The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission.)	(See detailed written submission / relief sought from Napier Port.)	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Introduction	Grant Russell	202.61	Amend	Supports the PORTZ - Port Zone Introduction and Issues subject to amendments to better reflect the importance of Napier Port to the regional economy.	Amend the PORTZ - Port Zone Introduction and Issues as follows: Introduction The Port Zone applies to land occupied by the operational <del>Napier Port of Napier</del> Napier Port Limited (Napier Port) located at the base of Mataruahou (Bluff Hill), and adjacent to Breakwater Road, State Highway 50. Port noise and traffic are managed in separate chapters. The effects on people and the environment from discharges to air and coastal water are matters for the regional council. This chapter provides for port-related activities on the operational port located at the base of Bluff Hill. The infrastructure at the port includes facilities for the loading or unloading of cargo or passengers carried by sea, and may include port-related <u>industrial and commercial</u> facilities. <u>Napier Port brings to the region positive benefits including its contribution to the regional economy and the transport links via land and sea within New Zealand and its global reach for the import and export of vital goods and products.</u> There is a geographically separated area of Port Zone land between Breakwater Road and Mataruahou (Bluff Hill) that is subject to a natural hazards risk from rockfalls or landslides. As such this area is identified as a Specific Control Area within the Port Zone. Issues PORTZ-I2: Amenity values in the surrounding environment The level of effects experienced on properties in the vicinity of the port will not be the same as in other residential zones. The	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Issues /PORTZ-I1: Regional significance of Napier Port	Grant Russell	202.62	Support	The submitter supports the PORTZ - Port Zone PORTZ-I1: Regional significance of Napier Port Issues Statement.	Retain PORTZ-I1: Regional significance of Napier Port Issues Statement in its entirety.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Issues /PORTZ-I3: Public health and safety	Grant Russell	202.63	Amend	Supports PORTZ-I3: Public health and safety with an amendment to reflect the importance of managing biosecurity and border security at Napier Port given its maritime role.	Amend PORTZ-I3: Public health and safety as follows: The nature of activities at the port means restrictions on activities and on access to, along, and adjacent to the coastal marine area may be necessary for <u>biosecurity and border</u> security and to protect public health or safety.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Objectives /PORTZ-O1: Provide for Napier Port	Grant Russell	202.64	Support	The submitter supports PORTZ-O1: Provide for Napier Port and should be retained as it enables the port to carry out ongoing and vital operation, maintenance, and development activities as a port company.	Retain PORTZ-O1: Provide for Napier Port in its entirety.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Objectives /PORTZ-O2: The efficient and effective use and development of Napier Port	Grant Russell	202.65	Support	Supports PORTZ-O2: The efficient and effective use and development of Napier Port and should be retained as it provides for the safe, efficient, and effective use of the Napier port activities ensuring both functional and operational needs are met.	Retain PORTZ-O2: The efficient and effective use and development of Napier Port in its entirety as notified.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Objectives /PORTZ-O3: Mitigation of hazard risk	Grant Russell	202.66	Support	Supports PORTZ-O3: Mitigation of hazard risk as Health and safety and managing associated risks is a matter at the forefront for Napier Port. This objective should be retained as it acknowledges the wider natural hazards that may potentially impact the Port and the public and is supported by Napier Port.	Retain PORTZ-O3: Mitigation of hazard risk in its entirety.	Open Submission

# PORTZ - Port Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PORTZ - Port Zone /Policies /PORTZ-P1: Regional significance of Napier Port	Grant Russell	202.67	Amend	Considers PORTZ-P1: Regional significance of Napier Port Policy is supported with an amendment to reflect the importance of the environment as significant to Napier Port, along with the other existing elements listed in this Policy.	Amend PORTZ-P1: Regional significance of Napier Port as follows:To recognise the port's importance to the social, economic, <u>environment</u> , and cultural wellbeing of the region.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Policies /PORTZ-P2: Characteristics of port activities	Grant Russell	202.68	Support	Supports PORTZ-P2: Characteristics of port activities Policy as it aligns with the industrial nature of Port activities.	Retain PORTZ-P2: Characteristics of port activities Policy in its entirety as notified.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Policies /PORTZ-P3: Amenity values in the surrounding environment	Grant Russell	202.69	Support	Supports PORTZ-P3: Amenity values in the surrounding environment together with an amendment as it provides for practicable approaches to be adopted by Napier Port when addressing port infrastructure design and operational matters.	Seeks to support PORTZ-P3: Amenity values in the surrounding environment together with the following amendment:Port infrastructure and operations are designed and operated to ensure off-site nuisance effects, including artificial lighting, noise, dust, odour, and vibration, <u>[are] managed to limit mitigate as far as practicable</u> adverse effects on the amenity values of the surrounding environment.(Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Policies /PORTZ-P4: Port-related activities	Grant Russell	202.70	Support	Supports PORTZ-P4: Port-related activities Policy as it provides for appropriate structures required for port operational and functional needs.	Retain PORTZ-P4: Port-related activities Policy as notified to enable operational port activities and associated buildings and structures of an appropriate scale.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Policies /PORTZ-P5: Retail and office activities	Grant Russell	202.71	Support	Supports PORTZ-P5: Retail and office activities Policy as it enables appropriate retail and office activities at the Port but ensures potential impacts do not adversely impact on other commercially zoned places such as Napier's CBD.	Retain PORTZ-P5: Retail and office activities Policy as notified.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Policies /PORTZ-P6: Mitigation of hazard risk	Grant Russell	202.72	Support	Supports PORTZ-P6: Mitigation of hazard risk as a prudent Policy for an area owned by the Port that is subject to potential rock falls.	Retain PORTZ-P6: Mitigation of hazard risk in its entirety.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /PORTZ - Port Zone - Rules Table /General	Grant Russell	202.73	Oppose	The submitter opposes PORTZ - Port Zone - Rules Table - Matters of discretion references to PORTZ-P1, PORTZ-P2, PORTZ-P3, PORTZ-P4and PORTZ-P5 as not being discrete nor relevant to the activity requiring consent.	Delete PORTZ - Port Zone - Rules Table - Matters of discretion references to PORTZ-P1, PORTZ-P2, PORTZ-P3, PORTZ-P4and PORTZ-P5 where they are not discrete nor relevant to the activity requiring consent.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /PORTZ - Port Zone Rockfall Hazard Specific Control Area - Rules Table /General	Grant Russell	202.74	Support	Supports PORTZ - Port Zone Rockfall Hazard Specific Control Area - Rules Table as it is a prudent rule and classification given the potential hazard and risk associated with the installation of new or additional buildings in this specific area.	Retain PORTZ - Port Zone Rockfall Hazard Specific Control Area - Rules Table classification.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /PORTZ - Port Zone - Standards Table /PORTZ-S1: Height	Grant Russell	202.75	Support	The submitter supports PORTZ-S1: Height Standard as it enables for the operations and functions at Napier Port and as such it should be retained.	Retain PORTZ-S1: Height in its entirety as notified.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /PORTZ - Port Zone - Standards Table /PORTZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary	Grant Russell	202.76	Support	Retain the PORTZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary Standard including the preclusion of limited and public notification of applications under Notification status in its entirety.		Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /PORTZ - Port Zone - Standards Table /PORTZ-S3: Site coverage	Grant Russell	202.77	Amend	Considers PORTZ-S3: Site coverage is supported albeit with an amendment to Matters of Discretion Clause 11. of Fire and pest control as Fire control is considered to be a Building Act function, and pest (marine?) control is a biosecurity matter / responsibility of the Hawke's Bay Regional Council.	Amend PORTZ-S3: Site coverage Matters of Discretion Clause 11. as follows: <del>11. Fire and pest control, and</del>	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /PORTZ - Port Zone - Standards Table /PORTZ-S4: Aerials, lines, and support structures (other than for the purposes of a network utility operation)	Grant Russell	202.78	Support	Supports PORTZ-S4: Aerials, lines, and support structures (other than for the purposes of a network utility operation) as the Standard enables for the operational and functional requirements at the Napier Port and should be retained.	Retain PORTZ-S4: Aerials, lines, and support structures (other than for the purposes of a network utility operation) in its entirety.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Assessment criteria /PORTZ-AC1: All infringementsGeneral assessment matters	Grant Russell	202.79	Amend	Considers PORTZ-AC1: All infringements should be amended to ensure consistency of words when referring to council's reticulation networks.	Amend PORTZ-AC1: All infringements Assessment criteria as follows: PORTZ-AC1: All infringements Trade waste and wastewater infrastructure o. The extent to which the nature or scale of the activity will place additional demand <del>on public services on the council's reticulation networks.</del> r. The volume and composition of any discharge and the effects on the council's <u>reticulated networks</u> <del>utilities</del> and receiving environment.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Assessment criteria /PORTZ-AC1: All infringementsGeneral assessment matters	Grant Russell	202.80	Amend	Considers PORTZ-AC1: All infringements should be amended to ensure consistency of words when referring to council's reticulation networks.	Amend PORTZ-AC1: All infringements Assessment criteria as follows: Stormwater managementx. Whether there is a risk that accidental spills or wash-down areas may contain hazardous substances or contamination that may enter stormwater or the council's <u>reticulated</u> networks.	Open Submission

# PORTZ - Port Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PORTZ - Port Zone /Assessment criteria /PORTZ-AC1: All infringementsGeneral assessment matters	Grant Russell	202.81	Oppose	Opposes PORTZ-AC1: All infringements as Fire control is considered to be a Building Act function, and pest management planning is a biosecurity matter / responsibility of the Hawke's Bay Regional Council.	Delete PORTZ-AC1: All infringements as follows <del>Fire and pest control</del> <del>ag. The extent to which the activity implements an approved fire or pest management plan.</del>	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /PORTZ - Port Zone - Rules Table /PORTZ-R1: Any port-related activities	Georgina McPherson	215.172	Support	PORTZ-R1 applies to 'port-related activities' which as defined in the Proposed Plan includes under clause (f): fuel and ancillary pipeline networks. This is supported by the Fuel Companies, as it enables their wharflines to be maintained and upgraded as a permitted activity.	Retain rule PORTS-R1 as notified.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Issues /PORTZ-I2: Amenity values in the surrounding environment	denise fastier	245.1	Oppose	Considers that there is unreasonable traffic noise outside excepted hours in a mixed residential/ commercial zone. Seeks quiet times between 10pm to 6am so residents can sleep.	Seeks quiet times between 10pm to 6am so residents can sleep. No specific relief sought	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /PORTZ - Port Zone - Rules Table /PORTZ-R3: Multi-unit development for port activities	denise fastier	245.10	Amend	Considers that there is unreasonable traffic noise outside excepted hours in a mixed residential/ commercial zone. Seeks quiet times between 10pm to 6am so residents can sleep.	Seeks quiet times between 10pm to 6am so residents can sleep. No specific relief sought	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Objectives /PORTZ-O1: Provide for Napier Port	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.117	Support	Supports PORTZ - Port Zone Objective PORTZ-O1: Provide for Napier Port as Ravensdown's Port Store, which is located in the PORTZ, is a 'port-related activity' (refer earlier submission point) with this objective aiming to enable port activities, while also ensuring that off-site adverse effects are appropriately managed.	Retain Objective PORTZ-O1 as notified.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Objectives /PORTZ-O2: The efficient and effective use and development of Napier Port	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.118	Support	Supports PORTZ-O2: The efficient and effective use and development of Napier Port as in enabling port and port-related activities to take place within the PORTZ (as provided for by PORTZ-O1), it is important to ensure that these activities are not subject to reverse sensitivity effects from sensitive activities within the zone.	Retain Objective PORTZ-O2 as notified.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /PORTZ - Port Zone - Rules Table /PORTZ-R4: Port-related industrial activity, transport, storage, and goods handling	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.119	Support	The submitter supports PORTZ-R4: Port-related industrial activity, transport, storage, and goods handling as Rule PORTZ-R4 provides for 'port-related activities' as a permitted activity, subject to compliance with the PORTZ standards (Rule PORTZ-R4A). Where the PORTZ standards are not complied with, port-related activities require a resource consent as a discretionary activity (Rule PORTZ-R4B). As Ravensdown's Port Store is a 'port-related activity' (refer to above), this 'port-related activity' permitted activity rule is supported.	Retain Rule PORTZ-R4 as notified.	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Objectives /PORTZ-O1: Provide for Napier Port	Trevor Ellis	253.103	Amend	Considers that PORTZ-O1 is a strong enabling policy for the Port. However, the Port area is surrounded by a multitude of coastal marine habitats and ecosystems such as sheltered shallow reefs, sheltered shallow sand, and shallow beach. The language should be amended to consider that significant adverse effects on the environment are sufficiently avoided, minimised, or remedied.	Seeks to amend PORTZ-O1 as follows: PORTZ-O1: Provide for Napier Port The ongoing operation, maintenance, and development of the port is enabled, while <del>managing</del> <u>avoiding, minimising, and remedying</u> off-site adverse effects on the environment	Open Submission
PORTZ - Port Zone /Policies /General	Trevor Ellis	253.104	Amend	Considers that with PORTZ-O1's amendment request, a new policy should be implemented alongside the amendment to give effect to it.	Seeks to insert a new policy that requires significant adverse effects on the environment in and from the Port to be avoided, minimised, and remedied.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
PORTZ - Port Zone /PORTZ - Port Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.99	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency’s main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB-S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure and that new connections under the water supply bylaw will not be granted where there is insufficient capacity available within the water supply network for the proposed activity.</p>	<p>Seeks to include a new performance standard as follows:</p> <p><u>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</u></p> <p><u>1. All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u></p> <p><u>2. Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p><u>Matter of discretion:</u></p> <p><u>1. The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.</p>	Open Submission

# STADZ - Stadium Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Standards Table /STADZ-S5: Fences and walls	Susan Dallas	25.38	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.(Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Standards Table /STADZ-S5: Fences and walls	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.35	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone /Introduction	Cameron Drury	170.3	Amend	Improve clarity in relation to enabling events within the zone.	Insert paragraph advising the Temporary Activity rules and standards (TEMP) apply over the area-specific Stadium Zone (STADZ) rules and standards.	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Rules Table /STADZ-R4: Entertainment activities	Cameron Drury	170.4	Amend	Considers that to avoid contradiction it is necessary to amend 1(b) or 1(c) so that 1(b) does not contradict 1(c) i.e. the noise limits in STADZ-S6 supersede the noise limits in NOISE-R1.	Amend STADZ-R4 1(b) or 1(c) so that 1(b) does not contradict 1(c) i.e. the noise limits in STADZ-S6 supersede the noise limits in NOISE-R1.	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Standards Table / STADZ-S6: Noise events	Cameron Drury	170.5	Amend	Considers the need to better enable the use of McLean Park facilities to host community events.	Include Fridays within the 6 hour duration allowance. Extend the durations in both allowances to 11.00pm.	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone /Introduction	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.25	Amend	Communicate in the introduction to the zone that the Reserve Management Plan is also relevant to assessing activities and development in the zone.	Insert: "Activities and uses on publicly owned land must obtain permission (such as a lease or a licence) from the Council as the administering authority, and are assessed as required by the Reserves Act 1977 and any relevant reserves management plan. This is in addition to any requirements under the District Plan and the RMA. In assessing resource consent applications required under the District Plan, the Council will have regard to the relevant reserve management plan for the area."	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone /Assessment criteria	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.29	Amend	The current assessment criteria in the open space zones refer only to "any values identified in an approved Resource Management Plan". In addition to values, Reserve Management Plans (and plans under the Conservation Act) may refer to activities, structures and other methods. These plans are a relevant consideration under s104 for decision making on resource consents and will assist in ensuring an integrated approach to planning. Therefore the criteria should require wider regard be given to these other plans".	Add a new assessment criteria: <u>Whether the proposal is consistent with the outcomes sought in any relevant adopted reserve management plan, conservation management strategy or conservation management plan.</u>	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone	Amelia Longley	222.17	Amend	Whilst overall Council Parks and Reserves Management Team supports the provision of a Stadium Zone for McLean Park and its broad direction to manage effects on the environment as set out in the objectives and policy framework, there are challenges with interpreting the rule framework including definitions of activities (or lack of them), rules and standards, and how provisions relate to other chapters, in particular the 'Temporary Activities' and 'Noise' chapters. The rules and standards as currently written could result in unintended outcomes for McLean Park. The submission points on this Chapter provide examples of some of these issues, but there may be others or additional consequential amendments required as part of to clarify how these provisions work.	Amend provisions of STADZ zone to ensure integration with Noise and Temporary Activity chapter provisions and clarify activities intended for this zone.Redraft the rules standards and assessment criteria to integrate with the Temporary Activities and Noise chapters of the PDP. Clarify activities intended for this zone, and ensure corresponding activity definitions are provided to give clear guidance to managers of McLean Park and adjacent residential neighbours as to acceptable levels of effect including the frequency and impacts of temporary events.	Open Submission

# STADZ - Stadium Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
STADZ - Stadium Zone	Amelia Longley	222.101	Amend	<p>Generally support the introduction and objective and policy framework with minor amendments.</p> <p>Delete reference to other related chapters from Introduction and move to rule section to provide clearer direction to Plan users.</p>	<p>Amend as follows: STADZ - Stadium Zone Introduction The purpose of the Stadium Zone is to provide for the operation and development of large-scale multi-use sport, recreation, and community facilities, buildings, and structures, with capacity to host local, regional, national, and international events providing entertainment to residents and visitors. In Napier City, the Stadium Zone applies to McLean Park.</p> <p>McLean Park comprises an international standard outdoor turf sportsground, stands, and associated lighting. The park's main uses have traditionally been rugby and cricket at international and provincial levels. Other events held on the park have included pipe band contests, displays, and marching competitions. A multi-function indoor stadium — Centennial Event Centre — complements the outdoor facility.</p> <p>The park is named in memory of Donald McLean who, as Native Minister and Government Land Commissioner, purchased a large block of land from local Maori in the early days of European settlement in this area.</p> <p>In 1905, a trust was formed to establish a memorial to Sir Donald McLean and to that end ten acres was purchased for recreational purposes - the future McLean Park. In its early years, the Highland Society was very strong and the park was mainly used for Highland</p>	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Rules Table	Amelia Longley	222.102	Amend	<p>Amendment sought to clarify that any applicant must also refer to Reserves Act legislation and the relevant Reserves Management Plan. This is particularly important for new activities establishing on Council parks. It also clarifies that provisions in other district wide sections of the District Plan may also be relevant.</p>	<p>Amend as follows <u>Note1: In addition to these provisions of the District Plan, the provisions of the Reserves Act 1977 and associated Reserve Management Plan also apply.</u> <u>Note 2: It is important to note that in addition to the provisions in this chapter, the following Part 2: District-Wide Matters / General District-Wide Matters may also apply:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· NU – Network Utilities</li> <li>· TPT- Transport</li> <li>· EW – Earthworks</li> <li>· LIGHT – Light</li> <li>· NOISE - Noise</li> <li>· SIGN – Signs</li> </ul> <p>TEMP – Temporary Activities</p>	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Rules Table /STADZ-R1: Additions, alterations, maintenance, and repair to existing buildings	Amelia Longley	222.103	Amend	<p>The term 'addition' can be clarified by a reference to the Gross Floor Area, which is defined in the Interpretation section of the Plan. However the term 'alteration' is not defined in the PDP, and the terms 'maintenance' and 'repair' are only used in reference to heritage items / network utilities/ and renewable energy. These activities could occur as ancillary activities and specifying them in this rule is unnecessary.</p>	<p><del>STADZ-R1: Addition to Gross Floor Area alterations, maintenance, and repair to existing buildings</del> STADZ-R1A Activity Status: Permitted Where: 1. The gross floor area of the addition does not exceed 75 m<sup>2</sup>, and 2. All Stadium Zone Standards are complied with. STADZ-R1B Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are: 1. Neighbourhood and open space character; 2. Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces, and 3. Quality living amenity environments for adjacent residential neighbours.</p>	Open Submission

# STADZ - Stadium Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Rules Table /STADZ-R2: New or relocated buildings	Amelia Longley	222.104	Amend	As permission is required from Council as landowner and parks and reserves are managed according to the Reserves Act 1977 and / or relevant Reserve Management Plans, a distinction between new and relocated buildings is not necessary. Clarify the relationship of this rule to temporary seating and the need for the Note in this rule. Amend reference to 'living environments' in matter of discretion 3 environments to provide clearer direction.	STADZ-R2A  Activity Status: Permitted  Where: 1. The gross floor area of the new building does not exceed 75 m <sup>2</sup> , and 2. All Stadium Zone Standards are complied with.  <u>Note: Refer to STADZ-R7 for temporary seating.</u> <u>STADZ-R2B</u>  Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: Restricted Discretionary  Matters of discretion are: 1. Neighbourhood and open space character; 2. Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces, and 3. <u>Quality living environments, amenity for adjacent residents</u>	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Rules Table /STADZ-R3: Recreational activities	Amelia Longley	222.105	Amend	Not necessary to limit recreational activities to 'sporting' as other recreational activities might also take place on McLean Park e.g Te Matatini, national marching competition etc As with Rules STADZ-R1 and STADZ-R2, it is also appropriate to link this rule to standards. Reference to Noise R1 in STADZ-R3B is for permitted activities but should reference rules and standards when these limits are breached.	STADZ-R3: Recreational activities STADZ-R3A  Activity Status: Permitted Where: 1. Any <del>recreational activity sporting event</del> , including commercial <del>and</del> entertainment activities ancillary to the activity: a. The noise limits in <u>Rule NOISE-R1 and Standard NOISE-S1 (Stadium Zone) apply;</u> b. <u>The limits in Rule TEMP R2 apply; and</u> c. <u>All Stadium Zone Standards are complied with.</u> <u>STADZ-R3B</u> - Activity Status where activity condition 1a. is not met: <u>Refer to:</u> <u>TEMP-Temporary Activities chapter Rule TEMP-R2; and</u> <u>NOISE-R17: Noise Generation (general) generated from temporary events.</u> <u>Activity Status where activity condition 1.c is not met:</u> <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> - <u>1. The matters of discretion stated for infringing the relevant standard(s).</u>	Open Submission



# STADZ - Stadium Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Rules Table /STADZ-R4: Entertainment activities	Amelia Longley	222.106	Amend	<p>There is no definition of 'entertainment' activities, and it is unclear how these relate to 'temporary noise events' (refer Rule TEMP-R2). The noise limits in NOISE R1 and STADZ-S6 are incompatible so both these conditions could not work together. (Refer also submission on Standard STADZ-S6.)</p> <p>If the intention of this rule is to allow for concerts and other noisy events (eg nitro circus) then it would be more appropriate to apply the Temporary noise event rule (Rule TEMP-R2).</p> <p>Alternatively, if the intention is to allow for the types of events that take place on McLean Park that generally comply with noise limits (eg garden show, or school balls/ conference events/ wedding banquets etc that tend to take place in Centennial Hall) then an alternative rule to provide specifically for these events is proposed with an associated definition. (Refer also submission on Interpretation chapter)</p>	<p>Delete and replace with new rule for Events (also refer proposed new definition for 'Events').</p> <p><u>STADZ-R4: Entertainment activities</u> <u>STADZ-R4A</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status: Permitted</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><del>1. Entertainment activities:</del></p> <p><del>a. The activity is not provided for by STADZ-R3;</del></p> <p><del>b. The noise limits in NOISE R1 apply, and</del></p> <p><del>c. Up to six noise events are permitted in any 12-month period where Standard STADZ-S6 is complied with.</del></p> <p><u>STADZ-R4B</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met:</u></p> <p><u>Refer to NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general).</u></p> <p><u>STADZ-R4 Event activities</u> <u>STADZ-R4A</u></p> <p>-</p> <p><u>Activity Status: Permitted</u></p> <p>-</p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>a. The noise limits in Rule NOISE-R1 apply;</u></p> <p><u>b. The limits in Rule TEMP R2 apply; and</u></p> <p><u>c. All Stadium Zone Standards are complied with</u> <u>STADZ-R4B</u></p>	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Rules Table /STADZ-R5: Vehicle parking areas	Amelia Longley	222.107	Oppose	<p>Vehicle parking areas are an ancillary activity therefore fall within the definitions for 'recreation activity' and 'community facilities'.</p> <p>In addition, Council is the manager of these spaces and any new vehicle parking areas will be subject to the provisions of a Reserve Management Plan. It is not appropriate or necessary for the District Plan to control these activities.</p>	Delete STADZ-R5.	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Rules Table /STADZ-R6: Commercial activities	Amelia Longley	222.108	Oppose	<p>This rule is very permissive for commercial activities on McLean Park. Commercial activities not ancillary to a STADZ permitted activity are not desirable within this zone.</p> <p>STADZ-R6B as proposed could potentially result in undesirable consequences for McLean Park e.g if an application for a commercial activity not ancillary a recreational activity be applied for eg a retail outlet, café or restaurant, Council could not refuse it and could only apply conditions on matters over which it has control.</p>	Delete STADZ-R6.	Open Submission

# STADZ - Stadium Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Rules Table /STADZ-R7: Temporary seating	Amelia Longley	222.109	Amend	<p>It is not clear why a rule for temporary seating has been included and if so why it does not provide for a level of permitted activity.</p> <p>Amend to provide for permitted activity status subject to conditions for example: association with a permitted activity, duration, times of installation (eg 7am -7pm), compliance with STADZ-S1 &amp; STADZS2, exemptions from STADZ4. Not necessary to control design and appearance of temporary seating.</p>	<p>Amend as sought or delete.STADZ-R7: Temporary seating</p> <p>Activity Status: <del>Controlled</del> <u>Permitted</u></p> <p>Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The temporary seating is associated with a permitted activity, and</li> <li>Temporary seating is exempt from the building coverage provision STADZ-S4 due to its temporary nature.</li> <li><u>Temporary seating complies with standards STADZ-S1 and STADZ-S2</u></li> <li><u>Set up and removal shall occur within 5 working days of the event for which it is required and between the hours of 7am-7pm</u></li> </ol> <p>Matters of control are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>The duration of how long the temporary seating will remain;</del></li> <li><del>The height and height in relation to boundary of the temporary seating;</del></li> <li><del>The design and appearance of the temporary seating, and</del></li> <li><del>The movement of traffic associated with the erection and dismantling of the temporary seating.</del></li> </ol> <p><u>Notification status: Any application under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified or notified on a limited basis.</u></p> <p>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: <u>NA Restricted Discretion</u></p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The duration of how long the temporary seating will remain;</li> </ol>	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Rules Table /STADZ-R8: Activities infringing standards	Amelia Longley	222.110	Amend	<p>This rule should only apply to permitted activities otherwise potentially could end up with a discretionary or non-complying activity that infringes standards being considered under this rule.</p> <p>Clarification of wording to assist in clearer interpretation of the Plan.</p>	<p>Amend as sought (or words to that effect)</p> <p>STADZ-R8: <u>Permitted</u> Activities infringing standards</p> <p>Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The matters of discretion stated for <del>infringing</del> the relevant standard(s) <u>being infringed</u>.</li> </ol>	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Rules Table /STADZ-R9: Community facilities	Amelia Longley	222.111	Amend	<p>Amend Rule STADZ -R9 to provide clearer direction that enables community facility activities on the site whilst noting that noisy events are limited as set out in the Noise and Temporary Activities chapters.</p>	<p>STADZ-R9: Community facilities <u>activities</u></p> <p>STADZ-R9A</p> <p>Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any community facility <u>activity</u>, including commercial and entertainment activities ancillary to the activity; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>The noise provisions in District Wide apply, and</del></li> <li><del>The temporary event provisions in District Wide apply;</del> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>The noise limits in Rule NOISE-R1 and Standard NOISE-S1 (Stadium Zone) apply;</u></li> <li><u>The limits in Rule TEMP R2 apply; and</u></li> <li><u>All Stadium Zone standards are complied with.</u></li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>STADZ-R9B</p> <p>Activity Status where activity conditions <u>1a and 1b</u> are not met: <u>TEMP-Temporary Activities chapter Rule TEMP-R2; and NOISE-R7: generated from temporary events.</u></p> <p>Activity Status where activity condition <u>1c</u> is not met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Restricted Discretionary</u></li> <li><u>Matters of discretion are:</u></li> <li><u>1. The matters of discretion stated for infringing the relevant standard(s).</u></li> </ul>	Open Submission

# STADZ - Stadium Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Rules Table /STADZ-R10: Residential activities	Amelia Longley	222.112	Oppose	The requirement for managers to live onsite is generally no longer required on Council reserves and therefore it is not necessary to have a separate rule for this type of activity. The default Rule STADZ-R12 is appropriate to cover instances where a Residential activity might be considered. Prohibited activity status is unnecessarily restrictive. The provisions of the Reserves Act 1977, and any relevant RMP would also apply.	Delete STADZ-R10.	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Rules Table /STADZ-R11: Industrial activities	Amelia Longley	222.113	Amend	There is no justification for 'Prohibited activity' status for activities in the Open Space zones and there may be some instance where you would want to permit industrial activities across a reserve e.g. pipes ancillary to an industrial activity. The default rule SARZ-R12 (Non-complying activity status is appropriate to provide for any such applications on McLean Park Stadium.	Delete STADZ-R11.	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Rules Table /STADZ-R12: Activities not otherwise provided for	Amelia Longley	222.114	Amend	Minor correction to reference correct rules.	STADZ-R12: Activities not otherwise provided for Activity Status: Non-complying Where: 1. The activity is not provided for under Rules <del>OSZ-R1 – OSZ-R11</del> STADZ-R1-STADZ-Rxx.	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Rules Table	Amelia Longley	222.115	Amend	Council has a large number of reserves whose primary purpose is to provide for stormwater overflow and drainage activities. It is important that these activities are enabled in the Open Space zones. It is not clear whether such activities are provided for as network utilities or not. If not, it would be appropriate to define these works (refer proposed definition) and have an associated enabling rule in the open space zones.	Clarify if the PDP provides for these types of activities elsewhere (eg in the Network Utilities chapter) and if not insert new rule as sought, (or words to that effect) <u>.STADZ-Rxxx: Stormwater and drainage activities</u> <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>1. The purpose of the activity supports the function and maintenance of Council owned reserves; and</u> <u>2. The drainage activities are undertaken by Council (or its contractors)</u>  <u>STADZ-Rxx</u> <u>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: Non-complying</u>	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Rules Table	Amelia Longley	222.116	Amend	The purpose of this rule is to allow for reserve maintenance activities and buildings associated with them to take place within this zone. A definition of 'reserves maintenance activities' is also proposed.	Insert new rule as outlined (or words to that effect). <u>STADZ-Rxx Reserve maintenance activities</u> <u>-</u> <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>-</u> <u>1. The purpose of the activity supports the function and maintenance of Council owned reserves; and</u> <u>2. The reserve maintenance activities are undertaken by Council (or its contractors)</u> <u>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: Non-complying.</u>	Open Submission

# STADZ - Stadium Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Standards Table /STADZ-S1: Height	Amelia Longley	222.117	Amend	Generally support this standard. Minor amendments sought for clarity.	<p>STADZ- S1-Height</p> <p>Purpose: to maintain a stadium character that facilitates appropriate activities; minimise effects on the quality of the neighbours' living environment</p> <p>1. Buildings and structures, excluding light towers, must not exceed 20 m in height.</p> <p>Activity Status where standards are not met: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Matters of discretion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Neighbourhood and open space character;</li> <li>2. Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces, and</li> <li>3. Quality <del>living environments</del> <u>amenity for adjacent residents.</u></li> </ol>	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Standards Table /STADZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary	Amelia Longley	222.118	Amend	Generally support this standard. Minor amendments sought for clarity.	<p>Amend as sought.</p> <p>STADZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary</p> <p>Purpose: To maintain a Stadium character that facilitates appropriate activities; maintain a reasonable level of sunlight access and minimise effects on the quality of <del>the residential</del> neighbours' <del>living environment</del> <u>amenity.</u></p> <p>1. Buildings must not project beyond a 45 degree recession plane measured from a point 3 m vertically above ground level along side and rear boundaries, as shown in STADZ-S2-Fig1 below.</p> <p>Figure 1 - Height in relation to Boundary</p> <p>2. Where the site abuts an entrance strip or access lot, the furthest boundary of the entrance strip or access lot may be deemed to be the site boundary for the purpose of the standard.</p>	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Standards Table /STADZ-S3: Yards	Amelia Longley	222.119	Amend	Generally support this standard. Minor amendments sought for clarity.	<p>STADZ-S3: Yards</p> <p>Purpose: to maintain a stadium character that facilitates appropriate activities; to provide for building maintenance; to provide for a safe and attractive streetscape.</p> <p>1. Any part of a building (including eaves and guttering) must not be erected closer than 6 m to any site boundary.</p> <p>Activity Status where standards are not met: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Neighbourhood and open space character;</li> <li>2. Safety, attractiveness and connectivity of streets and public open spaces, and</li> <li>3. Quality <del>living environments</del> <u>amenity for adjacent residents.</u></li> </ol>	Open Submission

# STADZ - Stadium Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Standards Table /STADZ-S4: Building coverage	Amelia Longley	222.120	Amend	Generally support this standard. Building coverage reflects existing built environment of McLean Park with restricted scope for further development on this site.	STADZ-S4: Building coverage  Purpose: to maintain open space to facilitate the activities anticipated in the Stadium Zone.  1. The maximum floorspace of buildings on a site must not exceed 30% of the net site area.  Activity Status where standards are: Restricted Discretionary  Matters of discretion are:  Neighbourhood and open space character; Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces, and <u>Quality living environments amenity for adjacent residents.</u>	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Standards Table /STADZ-S5: Fences and walls	Amelia Longley	222.121	Amend	Clarify how these rules will work with fencing requirements in the Residential Zone and achieve consistent fencing around the perimeter of public open spaces. This rule could result in undesirable outcomes for open space. Consistent fencing, providing for visual surveillance around the park boundaries, is desirable.	Delete or amend to clarify.	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Standards Table / STADZ-S6: Noise events	Amelia Longley	222.122	Oppose	This Standard links to Rule STADZ-R4 providing for up to six 'Entertainment Activities' that with noise limit of 75dBLAEQ(15 min).It is unclear how this standard relates to Rule TEMP-R2 1.a. that provides for up to 10 non-sporting events with different noise restrictions (85 dB LAeq (5 min), and up to 11 pm or 1 am on New Years eve).Preference is that activities that exceeds the general noise standards are controlled by the DWA for Temporary activities and associated Noise rules and standards.	Delete STADZ-S6.	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone /Assessment criteria /STADZ-R4B: Entertainment facilities not meeting permitted conditions (STADZ-S6 Noise events)	Amelia Longley	222.123	Oppose	In support of submission point on Standard STADZ-R4 delete provisions and address as a DWA temporary activity.	Delete STADZ-R4B.	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone /Assessment criteria /STADZ-AC1: Additions, alterations, maintenance, and repair to existing building not meeting permitted standards (STADZ-R1); New or relocated buildings (STADZ-R2)	Amelia Longley	222.124	Amend	Control of 'alterations, maintenance, and repair' of buildings whether new or relocated not appropriate in this zone.	Amend as sought: STADZ-AC1: Additions, <del>alterations, maintenance, and repair</del> to existing building not meeting permitted standards (STADZ-R1); New or relocated buildings (STADZ-R2).	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone /Assessment criteria /STADZ-AC2: Vehicle parking areas not meeting permitted conditions (STADZ-R5)	Amelia Longley	222.125	Oppose	As set out submission in relation to Standard STADZ-R5 Vehicle Parking areas not necessary to control parking areas in the manner sought.	Delete STADZ-AC2.	Open Submission

# STADZ - Stadium Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
STADZ - Stadium Zone /Assessment criteria /STADZ-AC3: Commercial activities not meeting permitted standards (STADZ-R6); Community facilities (STADZ-R9); Residential activities (OSZ-R10)	Amelia Longley	222.126	Amend	Consequential amendment to submission on rules. AC clause (h) is not relevant to the Stadium Zone.	STADZ-AC3: Commercial activities not meeting permitted standards (STADZ-R6); Recreation activities (STADZ-R3); Community facilities activities (STADZ-R9); Residential activities (OSZ-R10) Neighbourhood and stadium character a. The extent to which the character of the neighbourhood and the stadium is maintained by the proposed activity. This includes consideration of: i. any positive defining characteristics of the neighbourhood; ii. any values identified in an approved reserve management plan, and iii. the extent to which the proposed activities will compromise activities anticipated in the zone. Contribution to community wellbeing b. The extent to which locating the commercial activity in the Stadium Zone will contribute to the wellbeing of the local community. c. Whether that contribution could be achieved by locating the activity in a zone other than the Stadium Zone. Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces d. The extent to which access and parking associated with the activity will provide safe access to the activity for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. e. The extent to which: i. the anticipated traffic generation and/or anticipated on street car parking will impact on the safety and efficient operation of the surrounding integrated transport network, and	Open Submission
STADZ - Stadium Zone /STADZ - Stadium Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.100	Amend	Fire and Emergency's main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008. SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank. Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply. A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes. In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure and that new connections under the water supply bylaw will not be granted where there is insufficient capacity available within the water supply network for the proposed activity.	Seeks to include a new performance standard as follows: <u>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</u> 1. <u>All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u> 2. <u>Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u> <u>Matter of discretion:</u> 1. <u>The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u> Or To similar effect. And any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.	Open Submission

# STADZ - Stadium Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)

# TEZ - Tertiary Education Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TEZ - Tertiary Education Zone /TEDZ - Tertiary Education Zone - Standards Table /TEZ-S6: Fences and walls	Susan Dallas	25.37	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan. (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
TEZ - Tertiary Education Zone /TEDZ - Tertiary Education Zone - Standards Table /TEZ-S6: Fences and walls	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.36	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
TEZ -A4:H4 Tertiary Education Zone /TEDZ - Tertiary Education Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.101	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency's main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</p> <p>SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.</p> <p>In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure and that new connections under the water supply</p>	<p>Seeks to include a new performance standard as follows:</p> <p><u>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u></li> <li><u>Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.3</u></li> </ol> <p><u>Matter of discretion:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></li> </ol> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to</p>	Open Submission



# WTZ - Wastewater Treatment Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
WTZ - Wastewater Treatment Zone /WTZ - Wastewater Treatment Zone - Standards Table /WTZ-S4: Outdoor storage areas.	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.37	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
WTZ - Wastewater Treatment Zone /Assessment criteria - Wastewater Treatment Zone /	Wayne Ormsby	63.6	Amend	Expresses concerns in relation to the city's wastewater treatment plant being vulnerable to natural hazards.	It is inferred the submitter wishes to amend WTZ Assessment criteria to acknowledge the vulnerability of the wastewater treatment plant to natural hazards and to require landscaping such as stopbanks to provide some protection.	Open Submission
WTZ - Wastewater Treatment Zone /WTZ - Wastewater Treatment Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.102	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency's main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</p> <p>SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.</p> <p>In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure and that new connections under the water supply</p>	<p>To include a new performance standard as follows:</p> <p><u>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</u></p> <p>1. All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</p> <p>2. Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</p> <p><u>Matter of discretion:</u></p> <p>1. The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to</p>	Open Submission

# DEV1 - Te Awa Development Area

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
DEV1 - Te Awa Development Area / /	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.91	Amend	Napier City Council are seeking to update the infrastructure planning for Te Awa including the location and design of the stormwater and roading networks.	Consider updating the provisions and maps at Appendix 9 to reflect the most effective and efficient approach to servicing Te Awa, subject to full s32AA assessment for any changes.	Open Submission
DEV1 - Te Awa Development Area /General /General	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.99	Support	Supports the development areas as long as the amendments requested to any zone that enables residential development is adopted to provide educational facilities. The adoption of these provisions would enable educational facilities to support these development areas in the future.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
DEV1 - Te Awa Development Area /Issues /DEV1-I1: Integration of development and infrastructure provision	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.151	Support	Supports I1 as it recognises ad hoc development in this area can result in inefficient provision of infrastructure and adverse effect.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
DEV1 - Te Awa Development Area /Objectives /DEV1-O1: Integration of development and infrastructure provision	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.152	Support	Supports O1 as it supports integration of development and infrastructure provisions in an integrated and planned manner.	No specific relief sought	Open Submission
DEV1 - Te Awa Development Area /Objectives /DEV1-O2: Residential density	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.153	Support	Supports O2 as it provides for residential development to support efficient and affordable provisions of infrastructure.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

# DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Policies /Require residential development to contribute to Napier’s housing supply and the efficient provision of infrastructure by providing a minimum density of 24 residential units per hectare.  Relates to DEV2-O2	Sera Chambers	150.239	Oppose	opposes on the basis that existing adjoining property/landowners should have the same rights to consultation and impact mitigation requirements on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development in the Wharerangi Road Development Area may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated.	seeks to delete provision.	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /General /General	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.100	Support	Supports the development areas as long as the amendments requested to any zone that enables residential development is adopted to provide educational facilities. The adoption of these provisions would enable educational facilities to support these development areas in the future.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Introduction /	Phil Stickney	263.67	Amend	The Submitter supports in part the matters contained within the Introductory section. However, it is noted that the introduction references Map APP10 and states that this map denotes indicative open space, key connector roads, cycleways, and walkways. From the digital on-line version of APP10, the Submitter is not able to discern the majority of the mapping features set out in the Introductory section. This may be a graphic presentation error or an inadvertent omission.	Delete references to these features and the denoting on APP-10.	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Issues /DEV-I2: Recreation and connectivity	Phil Stickney	263.68	Oppose	DEV2-I2 and DEV-I3. DEV-I2 seeks to provide a centralised reserve with connectivity to the Taipo Stream and beyond. This is set out as a “requirement” but yet the Map in APP10 does not denote such a requirement. The Submitter considers that by creating connections to both the Taipo Stream and Saltwater Creek, as well as to Park Island to the immediate north, that there is no absolute starting premise to require the inclusion of a passive reserve area within the Development Area itself and that the need for a reserve should reasonably be assessed at the time that a consent application is lodged and is being considered by Council.	Amendments to DEV-I2 to focus on permeability and connections to existing open space areas and remove references to a centralised reserve for residents.	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Issues /DEV2-I3: Rural context	Phil Stickney	263.69	Oppose	DEV-I3 cites a potential effect but fails to recognise that the site is within a single ownership and that such matters can be managed as development progresses. The site is zoned for residential purposes and as such there is an expectation of a level of effect from a change from a rural land use to urban activities. It is further noted that DEV-I3 states that urban development may detract from the visual amenity of the surrounding rural environment. The Submitter notes that there is no surrounding rural environment. It is unclear as to what this provision seeks to achieve, and it is considered superfluous to managing the key environmental effects of development on a site zoned for residential and commercial use.	Delete DEV-I3	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Objectives /General	Phil Stickney	263.70	Amend	The Submitter supports in part the Objectives contained within DEV-O1 to DEV-O6 however seek some minor amendments to reflect the need to provide housing choice and a diversity of typologies within the DEV2 Area.	Include amendments to make clear reference to housing choice and variety being a key Objective for the DEV-2 Area.	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Policies /DEV2-P2: Density	Phil Stickney	263.71	Amend	The Submitter seeks an amendment to Policy DEV2-P2 to clarify the expected yield is a net density calculation (net of roads and reserves). Additional refinements to terminology employed in DEV2-P1 to DEV2-P5 is also sought to assist in clarity and useability of the Plan.	Amend DEV2-P2 to reflect a net density calculation and amendments to refine the balance of the policies in DEV2.	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area - Rules Table /General	Phil Stickney	263.72	Oppose	The Submitter notes that the underlying zonings are MRZ and LCZ. These are the subject of matters contained within this submission. The Submitter supports the approach taken with the underlying zoning on the basis that the relief sought in respect of those zonings is adopted.	Ensure alignment of the underlying zoning and the amendments to those rules sought.	Open Submission

# DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area - Standards Table	Phil Stickney	263.73	Oppose	<p>Oppose DEV2-S1 as the provision appears to render subdivision a restricted discretionary activity and any subdivision which does not comply with the standards as being discretionary. This is not aligned with the provisions of the District wide standards which render a complying subdivision as a Controlled Activity. Given that there are additional matters to be considered in DEV-2 and that this has been subject to considerable planning and assessment, the intent of the standard and the consent status afforded by the rule is unduly onerous.</p> <p>An addition to the proposed standards is sought by adding an additional Standard that provides for development within the identified Local Centre, enabling a single larger tenancy within this Local Centre site (which forms part of the area under the management of DEV2). Market assessment and economic analysis has confirmed that a single large tenancy, supported by smaller local retail stores can be established as part of the site and at a scale which will not adversely impact upon the surrounding retail centres, but conversely provide a benefit to future residents and the existing residential catchment.</p>	<p>Amend DEV2-S2 (in respect of subdivision) to be a Controlled Activity with a Restricted Discretionary status if standards are not achieved.</p> <p>Add a new rule to enable a single retail tenancy within the LCZ in DEV2 to be no larger than 2500sqm and limited to one such tenancy within this DEV Area.</p>	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Assessment criteria /DEV2-AC1: All subdivision and development	Phil Stickney	263.74	Amend	The Submitter seeks amendments to DEV2-AC1 (a) to render any subdivision to be in general accordance with the Wharerangi Road Development Plan APP-10, noting that the plan in question does not contain any additional information or detail which assists the user.	Amend DEV2-AC1(a) to include "general accordance" rather than "consistent". Minor tidying of terminology and clarity in the balance of criteria is sought to refine the provisions.	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Introduction /	Phil Stickney	263.81	Amend	The submitter seeks numerous changes to the Wharerangi Road Development Area chapter as shown in the full submission, Appendix 3.	Amend the Wharerangi Road Development Area chapter as outlined in Appendix 3 of the full submission.	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Issues /DEV2-I1 area of land.	Phil Stickney	263.82	Amend	<p>Seeks to make the following amendments:</p> <p>The <u>provision</u> of integrated infrastructure solutions for the Wharerangi Road Development Area <u>including the mitigation of potential inundation</u> will ensure that the <u>required development</u> full-density potential of the land is enabled through provision of sufficient capacity in the network. <del>Taipo Stream located to the west of the Development Area provides a potential source of flooding for this low lying area of land.</del></p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>The <u>provision of</u> integrated infrastructure solutions for the Wharerangi Road Development Area <u>including the mitigation of potential inundation</u> will ensure that the <u>required development</u> full-density potential of the land is enabled through provision of sufficient capacity in the network. <del>Taipo Stream located to the west of the Development Area provides a potential source of flooding for this low lying area of land.</del></p>	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Issues /DEV-I2: Recreation and connectivity	Phil Stickney	263.83	Amend	<p>Seeks to amend as follows:</p> <p><del>People expect to have reasonable access to Napier City's coastal environment, TeWhanga (Ahuriri estuary), waterways, and recreational reserves. The maintenance and enhancement of public access to the coast and waterbodies are recognised in the RMA as matters of national importance. A number of key recreational and open space areas adjoin the Development Area. These include the Taipo Stream corridor, and the Park Island recreational area to the north. These play adjacent to the Wharerangi Road Development Area, provides an important recreational and amenity role for future residents and development should consider connections to these existing recreational areas. opportunity for access to this waterbody and also for continuous off-road public access to Ahuriri Estuary to the north. Further, the number of residential units able to be developed in this area generates additional demand for areas of recreation. To provide for the recreational needs of residents, the Wharerangi Road Development Area requires a new centralised neighbourhood reserve with connectivity to Taipo Stream and beyond.</del></p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>People expect to have reasonable access to Napier City's coastal environment, TeWhanga (Ahuriri estuary), waterways, and recreational reserves. The maintenance and enhancement of public access to the coast and waterbodies are recognised in the RMA as matters of national importance. <u>A number of key recreational and open space areas adjoin the Development Area. These include the Taipo Stream corridor, and the Park Island recreational area to the north. These play adjacent to the Wharerangi Road Development Area, provides an important recreational and amenity role for future residents and development should consider connections to these existing recreational areas. opportunity for access to this waterbody and also for continuous off-road public access to Ahuriri Estuary to the north. Further, the number of residential units able to be developed in this area generates additional demand for areas of recreation. To provide for the recreational needs of residents, the Wharerangi Road Development Area requires a new centralised neighbourhood reserve with connectivity to Taipo Stream and beyond.</u></p>	Open Submission

# DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Issues /DEV2-I3: Rural context	Phil Stickney	263.84	Amend	Seeks to amend as follows:  At the time of preparation of the Wharerangi Road Development Area, most of the land <del>was and still</del> is utilised for rural purposes. Productive use of land enables efficient use and economic benefits to be gained until such time as urban development occurs. <del>Urban development may generate reverse-sensitivity issues on rural land uses and can also detract from the visual-amenity of the surrounding rural environment.</del> The provisions of the Development Area seek to recognise this issue as the area is developed.	Amend as follows:  At the time of preparation of the Wharerangi Road Development Area, most of the land <del>was and still</del> is utilised for rural purposes. Productive use of land enables efficient use and economic benefits to be gained until such time as urban development occurs. <del>Urban development may generate reverse-sensitivity issues on rural land uses and can also detract from the visual-amenity of the surrounding rural environment.</del> The provisions of the Development Area seek to recognise this issue as the area is developed.	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Objectives /DEV2-O1: Integration of development and infrastructure provision	Phil Stickney	263.85	Amend	Seeks to amend as follows:  Urban development and <u>the associated</u> provision of infrastructure in the Wharerangi Road Development Area occurs in an integrated and planned manner.	Amend as follows:  Urban development and <u>the associated</u> provision of infrastructure in the Wharerangi Road Development Area occurs in an integrated and planned manner.	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Objectives /DEV2-O2: Residential density	Phil Stickney	263.86	Amend	Seeks to amend as follows:  <del>A mixture of higher residential</del> Residential densities <u>will assist in the provision of enable efficient and affordable provision of infrastructure solutions.</u>	Amend as follows:  <del>A mixture of higher residential</del> Residential densities <u>will assist in the provision of enable efficient and affordable provision of infrastructure solutions.</u>	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Objectives /DEV2-O3: Connectivity	Phil Stickney	263.87	Amend	Seeks to amend as follows:  Development <u>layout provides connectivity to links residents</u> <del>to the surrounding wider</del> -environment including through the provision of integrated transport and reserve linkages.	Amend as follows:  Development <u>layout provides connectivity to links residents</u> <del>to the surrounding wider</del> -environment including through the provision of integrated transport and reserve linkages.	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Objectives /DEV2-O4: Resilience	Phil Stickney	263.88	Amend	Seeks to amend as follows:  Development is resilient to the <u>potential</u> effects of natural hazards including flooding from Taipo Stream.	Amend as follows:  Development is resilient to the <u>potential</u> effects of natural hazards including flooding from Taipo Stream.	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Objectives /DEV2-O5: Community wellbeing	Phil Stickney	263.89	Amend	Seeks to amend as follows:  <u>Connections to p</u> Public open space reflects the needs of residents and contributes to community wellbeing in the Wharerangi Road Development Area.  Relates to DEV2-I2	Amend as follows:  <u>Connections to p</u> Public open space reflects the needs of residents and contributes to community wellbeing in the Wharerangi Road Development Area.  Relates to DEV2-I2	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Objectives /DEV2-O6: Rural context	Phil Stickney	263.90	Amend	Seeks to amend as follows:  Rural production is <u>enabled</u> <del>and rural amenity values are maintained</del> until such time as the land is developed for urban activities.	Amend as follows:  Rural production is <u>enabled</u> <del>and rural amenity values are maintained</del> until such time as the land is developed for urban activities.	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Policies /DEV2-P1: Provision of infrastructure	Phil Stickney	263.91	Amend	Seeks to amend as follows:  Require subdivision and development <u>in the development area</u> to be coordinated with the provision of <u>sufficient</u> -stormwater, wastewater, water supply, energy, and telecommunications infrastructure.	Amend as follows:  Require subdivision and development <u>in the development area</u> to be coordinated with the provision of <u>sufficient</u> -stormwater, wastewater, water supply, energy, and telecommunications infrastructure.	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Policies /DEV2-P2: Density	Phil Stickney	263.92	Amend	Seeks to amend as follows:  <u>Enable Require</u> -residential development to contribute to Napier's housing supply and the efficient provision of infrastructure by providing a minimum <u>net site</u> density of 24 residential units per hectare.  Relates to DEV2-O2	Amend as follows:  <u>Enable Require</u> -residential development to contribute to Napier's housing supply and the efficient provision of infrastructure by providing a minimum <u>net site</u> density of 24 residential units per hectare.  Relates to DEV2-O2	Open Submission

# DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Policies /DEV2-P3: Connectivity and resilience	Phil Stickney	263.93	Amend	<p>Seeks to amend as follows:</p> <p>Subdivision and development <u>will</u> contributes <u>positively</u> to the connectivity <del>and resilience</del> of the area, including through:</p> <p>a. providing key roads, active mode connections, and <u>connections to open spaces</u> consistent with the APP10 - Wharerangi Road Development Area Map;</p> <p>b. <u>Mitigating potential</u> <del>ensuring development managed</del> flooding effects so that risks to people and property are not increased including through <u>the use of</u> appropriately designed and sited stopbanks and flood attenuation devices providing sufficient floodplain storage, and</p> <p>c. minimising the use of cul-de-sacs.</p> <p>Relates to DEV2-O3 and DEV2-O4</p>	<p>Seeks to amend as follows:</p> <p>Subdivision and development <u>will</u> contributes <u>positively</u> to the connectivity <del>and resilience</del> of the area, including through:</p> <p>a. providing key roads, active mode connections, and <u>connections to open spaces</u> consistent with the APP10 - Wharerangi Road Development Area Map;</p> <p>b. <u>Mitigating potential</u> <del>ensuring development managed</del> flooding effects so that risks to people and property are not increased including through <u>the use of</u> appropriately designed and sited stopbanks and flood attenuation devices providing sufficient floodplain storage, and</p> <p>c. minimising the use of cul-de-sacs.</p> <p>Relates to DEV2-O3 and DEV2-O4</p>	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Policies /DEV2-P5: Rural context	Phil Stickney	263.94	Amend	<p>Seeks to amend as follows:</p> <p>Recognise the <u>ongoing use of the Development Area interim rural context of the Wharerangi Development Area</u>, including by enabling non-intensive rural activities.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Recognise the <u>ongoing use of the Development Area interim rural context of the Wharerangi Development Area</u>, including by enabling non-intensive rural activities.</p>	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area - Standards Table	Phil Stickney	263.95	Amend	<p>Seeks to amend as follows:</p> <p><b>DEV2-S1B</b></p> <p><b>Activity Status where standards are not met: <u>Restricted Discretionary</u></b></p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p><b>DEV2-S1B</b></p> <p><b>Activity Status where standards are not met: <u>Restricted Discretionary</u></b></p>	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area - Standards Table	Phil Stickney	263.96	Amend	<p>Seeks to amend as follows:</p> <p>1. Subdivision must provide for a minimum density of 24 residential units per hectare <u>net site area</u> (net of roads and reserves).</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>1. Subdivision must provide for a minimum density of 24 residential units per hectare <u>net site area</u> (net of roads and reserves).</p>	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area - Standards Table /General	Phil Stickney	263.97	Amend	<p>Seeks to amend as follows:</p> <p><u>DEV2-S3A: Supermarket - Commercial Activity – Local Centre Zone</u>  <u>Purpose: to enable the provision of a single larger format supermarket to provide for the surrounding catchment</u></p> <p><u>DEV2-S3A</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status: Permitted Standards are:</u></p> <p><u>1.single tenancy of not greater than 2,500sqm gross Floor Area</u></p> <p><u>2. All other standards are achieved</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status where standards are not met:Restricted Discretionary</u></p>	<p>Seeks to amend as follows:</p> <p><u>DEV2-S3A: Supermarket - Commercial Activity – Local Centre Zone</u>  <u>Purpose: to enable the provision of a single larger format supermarket to provide for the surrounding catchment</u></p> <p><u>DEV2-S3A</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status: Permitted Standards are:</u></p> <p><u>1.single tenancy of not greater than 2,500sqm gross Floor Area</u></p> <p><u>2. All other standards are achieved</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status where standards are not met:Restricted Discretionary</u></p>	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Assessment criteria /DEV2-AC1: All subdivision and development	Phil Stickney	263.98	Amend	<p>Seeks to amend as follows:</p> <p>a. The extent to which the proposed subdivision and/or development is <u>in general accordance</u> <del>consistent</del> with the Wharerangi Road Development Plan APP10.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>a. The extent to which the proposed subdivision and/or development is <u>in general accordance</u> <del>consistent</del> with the Wharerangi Road Development Plan APP10.</p>	Open Submission

# DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Assessment criteria /DEV2-AC1: All subdivision and development	Phil Stickney	263.99	Amend	Seeks to amend as follows:  b. Whether the proposed subdivision and/or development provides <del>for the proposed walkway reserve connectivity onto link to between the neighbourhood reserve and the</del> Taipo Stream and Park Island. c. The extent to which the proposed transport network enhances connectivity to the wider environment, including the Taipo Stream esplanade reserve and Park Island. d. The extent to which proposed streets are orientated north-south to maximise the quality of living environments including sunlight access. e. The extent to which the road layout enhances connectivity and achieves an integrated approach to land use and transportation planning. This includes: i. the <del>incorporation of use of</del> on-street traffic calming, including <del>through</del> methods such as cycle lanes, on-street car parking and berm design., <del>shall be considered fundamental design elements of the street cross-section,</del> and ii. minimising the use of cul-de-sacs.	Amend as follows:  b. Whether the proposed subdivision and/or development provides <del>for the proposed walkway reserve connectivity onto link to between the neighbourhood reserve and the</del> Taipo Stream and Park Island. c. The extent to which the proposed transport network enhances connectivity to the wider environment, including the Taipo Stream esplanade reserve and Park Island. d. The extent to which proposed streets are orientated north-south to maximise the quality of living environments including sunlight access. e. The extent to which the road layout enhances connectivity and achieves an integrated approach to land use and transportation planning. This includes: i. the <del>incorporation of use of</del> on-street traffic calming, including <del>through</del> methods such as cycle lanes, on-street car parking and berm design., <del>shall be considered fundamental design elements of the street cross-section,</del> and ii. minimising the use of cul-de-sacs.	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Assessment criteria /DEV2-AC1: All subdivision and development	Phil Stickney	263.100	Amend	Seeks to amend as follows:  g. Whether the proposed subdivision and/or development provides for the <del>consistent</del> landscaping treatment of streets and reserves that <u>will</u> contribute to urban amenity and landscape values and retains and enhances vistas through the Wharerangi Road Development Area.	Amend as follows:  g. Whether the proposed subdivision and/or development provides for the <del>consistent</del> landscaping treatment of streets and reserves that <u>will</u> contribute to urban amenity and landscape values and retains and enhances vistas through the Wharerangi Road Development Area.	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Assessment criteria /DEV2-AC1: All subdivision and development	Phil Stickney	263.101	Amend	Seeks to amend as follows:  h. Whether the proposed <del>subdivision and/or development</del> <del>at</del> ensures that development manages flooding effects so that the risks to people and property (including infrastructure) are not increased. <del>for all flood events.</del>	Amend as follows:  h. Whether the proposed <del>subdivision and/or development</del> <del>at</del> ensures that development manages flooding effects so that the risks to people and property (including infrastructure) are not increased. <del>for all flood events.</del>	Open Submission
DEV2 - Wharerangi Road Development Area /Assessment criteria /DEV2-AC1: All subdivision and development	Phil Stickney	263.102	Amend	Seeks to amend as follows:  j. Whether there is sufficient capacity in the existing or proposed <del>utilities network, and public</del> reticulated water supply, wastewater, and stormwater network to service the proposed development.	Amend as follows:  j. Whether there is sufficient capacity in the existing or proposed <del>utilities network, and public</del> reticulated water supply, wastewater, and stormwater network to service the proposed development.	Open Submission

# DEV3 - Mission Development Area

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
DEV3 - Mission Development Area /Issues /DEV3-12: Potential public benefit of a walkway network (between Pukekura/Sugar Loaf and Park Island) along the hills behind the Mission	Jayden Mellsoy	5.1	Support	Supports the addition of significant landscape amenity feature to the Taradale hills for community and visitor use	Amend to widen the scope of the paths to link all local/discrete reserves up together	Open Submission
DEV3 - Mission Development Area /Policies	Jayden Mellsoy	5.2	Amend	Amend as the current bare south and eastern facing hills are an eyesore without vegetation, as well as a fire hazard.	Amend to widen the scope of woodland provision to include all seen faces of the Taradale hills to protect the landscape value of the hills	Open Submission
DEV3 - Mission Development Area /Issues /DEV3-16: Subdivision and development can have significant adverse effects on natural and physical resources and on cultural and heritage sites, including cumulative effects	Margaret Symons	34.1	Oppose	Opposes the stormwater provisions relating to the Mission Development Area due to the potential to impact on the Puketapu, Waiohiki and Taradale land and water resources. Additional stormwater discharged into the Tutaekuri River could result in significant flood damage to Taradale and Napier properties.	Amend the stormwater provisions relating to the Mission development.	Open Submission
DEV3 - Mission Development Area /Policies /DEV3-P9: Walkway and cycleway networkEnable the use of the eastern hill face for the development of a walkway and cycleway network.  Relates to DEV3-O3	Cameron Drury	128.2	Oppose	Inconsistent with the alignment of public paths in the Mission Special Character Zone Structure Plan. Assessment criteria in the relevant precincts require consideration of an interconnected public path network generally consistent with the Structure Plan Map in Appendix 7(a) so this does not need to be duplicated in the Development Area.	Delete Policy.	Open Submission
DEV3 - Mission Development Area /Assessment criteria /DEV3-AC1: All subdivision and development	Cameron Drury	128.29	Oppose	Oppose DEV3-AC1(b) - The extent to which the objectives and policies for the Mission Development Area will be achieved is a section 104(1)(a) matter and does not need to be re-traversed in an assessment criteria.	Delete (b).	Open Submission
DEV3 - Mission Development Area /Assessment criteria /DEV3-AC1: All subdivision and development	Cameron Drury	128.30	Amend	DEV-AC1(g)-(h) - The stormwater solution for the Development Area is regulated by the HBRC stormwater discharge permit – meaning (g) – (h) are not necessary. Further, use of the word ‘wetland’ may be misleading i.e. low impact stormwater solutions involving attenuation and planted swales may appear as wetlands but may not meet the strict definition of wetlands.	Delete (g) and (h).	Open Submission
DEV3 - Mission Development Area /Assessment criteria /DEV3-AC1: All subdivision and development	Cameron Drury	128.31	Amend	Amend DEV3-AC1(i) - Design Outcome 2 of the ODP as developed through the Plan Change process included a statement that stormwater infrastructure is to be vested in Council. This direction should remain.	Amend (i) to give direction that stormwater infrastructure is to be vested in Council.	Open Submission
DEV3 - Mission Development Area /Assessment criteria /DEV3-AC1: All subdivision and development	Cameron Drury	128.32	Oppose	Oppose DEV3-AC1(n)-(q) - These provisions were determined as part of the original Plan Change to apply to the landscape and Visitor Precinct / Rural Production Precinct / Rural Residential Precinct.	Amend to clarify they do not apply to the Residential Precinct.	Open Submission
DEV3 - Mission Development Area /Assessment criteria /DEV3-AC1: All subdivision and development	Cameron Drury	128.33	Oppose	Oppose DEV3-AC1(o) - (iii) refers to planting of the Eastern Hill face being for the purpose of screening houses in the Residential Precinct when viewed from Church Road. The owner of land within which the Residential Precinct is located does not own the eastern hill face so has no way of implementing this outcome.	Amend (iii) to refer to softening rather than screening as strict implementation of (iii) in its current form is not possible.	Open Submission
DEV3 - Mission Development Area /General /General	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.101	Support	Supports the development areas as long as the amendments requested to any zone that enables residential development is adopted to provide educational facilities. The adoption of these provisions would enable educational facilities to support these development areas in the future.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
DEV3 - Mission Development Area /General /General	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.101	Support	Supports the development areas as long as the amendments requested to any zone that enables residential development is adopted to provide educational facilities. The adoption of these provisions would enable educational facilities to support these development areas in the future.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission



# DEV3 - Mission Development Area

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
DEV3 - Mission Development Area / /	Peter Holley	235.5	Amend	<p>Amendments are sought to the Mission Development Area Chapter to enable the implementation of the Mission Masterplan and specifically a new Mission Church Road Residential Precinct and an Artisan Village area within the Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct.</p> <p>Full details as to the reasons for requesting these changes are outlined in the s.32 report, however a summary of these are outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed changes progress the best value of land-use mix and presents an opportunity to provide for residential development at a greater density than enabled by the underlying Rural Lifestyle Zone;</li> <li>- The land has limited productive value;</li> <li>The land is generally higher in elevation and is therefore less susceptible to natural hazards than much of urban Napier;</li> <li>- The land is located immediately opposite existing residential land and the currently developing Mission Residential Precinct behind it;</li> <li>- The proposal is generally consistent with relevant PDP policy direction (particularly DEV3);</li> <li>- Technical supporting information demonstrates feasibility;</li> <li>- Four reasonably practicable options have been considered, and it has been found that the proposed approach is the most effective and efficient;</li> <li>- There are a number of environmental, economic, social and cultural benefits, as well as costs (as detailed in the s.32 report).</li> </ul>	Amend the provisions of DEV3 as set out in the attached document showing the additions and deletions sought, as as detailed in submission points 235.18 - 235.25.	Open Submission
DEV3 - Mission Development Area /Introduction /General	Peter Holley	235.18	Amend	Amendments are required to DEV3 - Mission Development Area to enable a new chapter to be incorporated in the District Plan for the Mission Church Road Residential Precinct.Refer to the full submission for more detail. A summary of the reasons for requesting changes is outlined in submission point 235.2.	Amend the introduction to the Mission Development Area to recognise the introduction of the Mission Church Road Residential Precinct.	Open Submission
DEV3 - Mission Development Area /Issues /DEV3-13: A lack of diversity in the options available for greenfield residential development within the city and the need for an elevated and landform responsive option	Peter Holley	235.19	Amend	Amend DEV3 - Mission Development Area as a consequential change to enable the changes requested. The reasons provided in the s.32 report (refer full submission) are summarised in submission point 235.2.	<p>Amend DEV3-13 as follows:</p> <p>Existing greenfield residential building areas within the City are all located on flat topography with a conventional suburban layout. A supply of elevated and undulating land offering different section sizes and <u>housing types</u> would provide greater housing choice.</p>	Open Submission
DEV3 - Mission Development Area /Issues /DEV3-14: Urban development can impact on the sustainability of the city's remaining versatile and highly productive land resource, including the Mission Estate flats	Peter Holley	235.20	Amend	Amend DEV3-14 as a consequential amendment to enable the requested changes. A summary of reasons given for the proposed changes can be found in submission point 235.2.	<p>Amend DEV3-14 as follows:</p> <p>....The Mission Estate <u>vineyard</u> flats, in their current un-urbanised form and viticultural use, contribute to landscape and amenity values.</p>	Open Submission
DEV3 - Mission Development Area /Issues /DEV3-15: The potential of the Mission property to contribute further to the city as a tourism destination	Peter Holley	235.21	Amend	Amend DEV3-15 as a consequential amendment to the changes requested. The reasons provided for the changes requested are summarised in submission point 235.2 (see full submission for s.32 report)	<p>Amend DEV3-15 as follows:</p> <p>... There is the potential to add an additional layer to this vertical integration by providing <u>associated tourist commerce and accommodation</u> through both the use of existing former seminary buildings and the development of a new "<u>artisan village</u>" as well as standalone accommodation buildings. The potential contribution to the cycle and walkway network would also provide additional tourism opportunities. Development of new tourism infrastructure has the potential to reduce the values of the landscape, heritage, archaeological and versatile land resources that create the special character. There is also potential for additional tourism development to create off site effects. The size of the Development Area means that potential adverse effects on these values or on neighbouring residents can be avoided or mitigated.</p>	Open Submission

# DEV3 - Mission Development Area

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
DEV3 - Mission Development Area /Policies /DEV3-P2: Landscape – eastern hill face	Peter Holley	235.22	Amend	Amend DEV-P2 as a consequential amendment (refer to full submission for more detail): Submission point 235.2 provides a summary of the reasons given for the change.	Amend DEV3-P2 as follows:  ....by requiring the implementation and retention of woodland planting to the hill face to retain its <del>undeveloped natural</del> appearance and to stabilise...	Open Submission
DEV3 - Mission Development Area /Policies /DEV3-P7: Precincts	Peter Holley	235.23	Amend	Amend DEV3-P7 as a consequential change. The reasons given for the changes requested are summarised in Submission Point 235.2.	Amend DEV3-P7 as follows:  Manage the use and development of the Mission Development Area within <del>four</del> <u>five</u> precincts of like character and physical attributes. The precincts consist of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Residential Precinct (comprising the north western segment of the zone);</li> <li>• <u>the Church Road Residential Precinct;</u></li> <li>• the Productive Rural Precinct (correlating with the boundaries of the former Main Rural Zone on the flats fronting Church Road);</li> <li>• the Landscape and Visitor Precinct (comprising the existing Mission Estate buildings and facilities and the eastern hill face); and</li> <li>• the Rural Residential Precinct (comprising the balance of the zone, being the south western and <del>south eastern</del> corners).</li> </ul>	Open Submission
DEV3 - Mission Development Area /Policies /DEV3-P8: Innovation	Peter Holley	235.24	Amend	Amend DEV3-P8 as a consequential amendment. The reasons for making this change is summarised in submission point 235.2.	Amend DEV3-P8 as follows:  To enable innovative approaches to land use and development within the Mission Development Area to enhance tourism, <del>residential and and /</del> <del>or</del> recreation <del>opportunity</del> opportunities provided that such approaches do not undermine the values that contribute to the Character of the area.	Open Submission
DEV3 - Mission Development Area /Assessment criteria /DEV3-AC1: All subdivision and development	Peter Holley	235.25	Amend	Amend DEV3-AC1 as a consequential amendment. The reasons provided in the full submission have been summarised in submission point 235.2.	Amend DEV3-AC1 as follows: <b>General</b> a. The extent to which the proposed subdivision and/or development is consistent with the Mission Structure Plan as set out in the maps at Appendix <u>APP7(a) – (j)</u> ... d. Whether the green network is designed to <u>integrated</u> stormwater management .... e. ....i. ....Alternatively, the southern walkway connection... ..... g. ....i. Be in general accordance with the drawings in Appendix <u>APP13E7(e) or APP7(h)</u> . or APP7(h).... h. ... Whether wetlands are proposed to be constructed in step with the staging of development within the relevant catchments identified in Appendix <u>13E APP7(e) or APP7(h) or APP7(h)</u> and as per the ‘Residential Precinct 3 Waters Staging Plan’ in Appendix 13DAPP7(d) ..... n..... c.iii. <del>The separate cluster of ‘retreat’ buildings on the hillside at Mary Knoll. It is noted that other buildings are part of the existing landscape including the cluster of winery buildings below the Grande Maison, including the historic cellars, the traditional woolshed, and other scattered rural buildings amongst the vineyard.....</del> p. Whether the subdivision and development provides for a buffer between the <del>Mission Residential Precinct and Mission Productive-</del>	Open Submission

# DEV3 - Mission Development Area

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
DEV3 - Mission Development Area /Objectives /DEV3-01: Special character	Trevor Ellis	253.105	Amend	Considers that special character of a zone includes the ecological resources and values of the zone. Adding in that ecological values will assist in maintaining special character.	<p>Seeks to amend DEV3-01 as follows:</p> <p>DEV3-01: Special character</p> <p>The special character of the Mission Development Area is maintained through sustainable management, including the retention and enhancement of the values of the landscape, heritage, cultural, archaeological, <u>ecological</u>, and versatile land resources.</p>	Open Submission

# HBAL - Hawke's Bay Airport Limited

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HBAL - Hawke's Bay Airport Limited /Conditions /	Sera Chambers	150.61	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	Amend to include mitigation requirements for HBAL to mitigate noise for affected landowners as per Port Noise Mitigation Requirements.	Open Submission
HBAL - Hawke's Bay Airport Limited /Conditions /	Sera Chambers	150.62	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	Amend to include mitigation requirements for HBAL to mitigate noise for affected landowners as per Port Noise Mitigation Requirements.	Open Submission
HBAL - Hawke's Bay Airport Limited /Hawke's Bay Airport Limited Designations /	Sera Chambers	150.243	Oppose	Opposes	No relief sought	Open Submission
HBAL - Hawke's Bay Airport Limited /Hawke's Bay Airport Limited Designations /	Sera Chambers	150.244	Oppose	opposes	no relief sought	Open Submission
HBAL - Hawke's Bay Airport Limited /Definitions used in these conditions /	Sera Chambers	150.245	Oppose	opposes designation on the basis that the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners should be the guiding principle and that adjoining landowners should be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Open Submission
HBAL - Hawke's Bay Airport Limited /Conditions /	Sera Chambers	150.246	Oppose	opposes designation on the basis that the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners should be the guiding principle and that adjoining landowners should be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Open Submission
HBAL - Hawke's Bay Airport Limited /Conditions /	Sera Chambers	150.247	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects. Submitter notes that in other parts of NZ where an airport has increased its noise effect, consideration has been given to retrofitting acoustic insulation to existing houses depending on the noise levels.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
HBAL - Hawke's Bay Airport Limited /Conditions /	Sera Chambers	150.248	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations.	Open Submission
HBAL - Hawke's Bay Airport Limited /Conditions /	Sera Chambers	150.249	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects. Submitter notes that in other parts of NZ where an airport has increased its noise effect, consideration has been given to retrofitting acoustic insulation to existing houses depending on the noise levels.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
HBAL - Hawke's Bay Airport Limited /Conditions /	Sera Chambers	150.250	Oppose	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	Open Submission

# HBAL - Hawke's Bay Airport Limited

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HBAL - Hawke's Bay Airport Limited /Conditions /	Sera Chambers	150.251	Oppose	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	The RMA is being replaced by the Central Government (government) with new resource management laws premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Any sections of the PDP that reference the RMA will need to be consulted on again as the information in the current version of the PDP may not fit legislative requirements.	Open Submission
HBAL - Hawke's Bay Airport Limited /Conditions /	Sera Chambers	150.252	Oppose	opposes designation on the basis that the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners should be the guiding principle and that adjoining landowners should be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Open Submission
HBAL - Hawke's Bay Airport Limited /Hawke's Bay Airport Limited Designations /General	Sera Chambers	150.306		opposes designation on the basis that the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners should be the guiding principle and that adjoining landowners should be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Open Submission
HBAL - Hawke's Bay Airport Limited /Hawke's Bay Airport Limited Designations /	Ellen Robotham	198.115	Amend	This designation protects the Airport and its function as a regionally significant infrastructure and Lifeline Utility. Currently there is no reference within the designation that directs the plan user to the maps at APP1.	Amend site identifier to reference APP1 instead of 111 Main North Road. Delete reference to M11 Matawhero Island.	Open Submission
HBAL - Hawke's Bay Airport Limited /Hawke's Bay Airport Limited Designations /	Ellen Robotham	198.116	Amend	This designation protects the Airport and its function as a regionally significant infrastructure and Lifeline Utility.	<p>Insert "Purpose" section as per the Notice of Requirement lodged on 26 July 2023.</p> <p>Insert one new condition as follows:</p> <p><u>Signs</u></p> <p><u>22. Signage that is location within 50m of State highway 2, excluding any signage required by the Civil Aviation Authority (or related legislation), must comply with the below requirements:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· <u>Each individual sign must not exceed 1 square metre in area or 2 metres for any edge dimension;</u></li> <li>· <u>The colour combination used for each sign's background, wording and legend must not be likely to cause confusion with any of those used for any official road sign or traffic sign;</u></li> <li>· <u>Each sign must not display more than 6 words, symbols, or graphics and no more than 40 characters;</u></li> <li>· <u>Lettering and symbols used must be at least 160 millimetres in height;</u></li> <li>· <u>No reflective materials shall be used; and</u></li> <li>· <u>Signs shall not be externally or internally illuminated.</u> Correct spelling and grammatical errors, including:</li> </ul> <p>Full stop before Aircraft operations in Condition 1.a. to be</p>	Open Submission
HBAL - Hawke's Bay Airport Limited /General /General	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.162	Support	Notes that NZTA is working with the Hawkes Bay Airport on designation conditions regarding signage visible from the state highway network.	No specific relief sought	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
KRHL - Kiwirail Holdings Limited /Kiwirail Holdings Limited Designations /	Hamish Blackberry	51.1	Oppose	Opposes and considers the Ahuriri Kiwirail Depot and Yards with the rolled-over KRHL - Kiwirail Holdings Limited KRHL-1: Railway purposes Designation and underlying General Industrial Zone have adverse effects upon neighbouring General Residential Zone character.	Seeks discussion about the future of the site and removal of the KRHL - Kiwirail Holdings Limited KRHL-1: Railway purposes Designation and the underlying General Industrial Zone from the Ahuriri Depot and Yards.	Open Submission
KRHL - Kiwirail Holdings Limited /Kiwirail Holdings Limited Designations /	Sheena McGuire	168.129	Amend	Supports the designations table for KiwiRail's designations. Minor corrections are sought to accurately reflect the company name (capitalized 'R') and all lines that extend through Napier City. KiwiRail supports the mapped extent of KRHL-1.	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>KRHL - KiwiRail Holdings Limited</p> <p>KiwiRail Holdings Limited Designations KRHL-1: Railway purposes</p> <p>Designation unique identifier: KRHL-1 Designation purpose: Railway purposes</p> <p>Site identifier: Palmerston North - Gisborne Railway Line, Napier Port Branch and Pandora North Connection including rail yards and bridges.</p> <p>Eskdale, Bay View, Northshore, Pandora, Ahuriri, Napier Port. Lapse date: Given effect to</p> <p>Designation hierarchy under section 177 of the Resource Management</p> <p>Act: Primary Conditions: No</p> <p>Additional information: Formerly designation D1 - Rolled over designation.</p>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MEDU - Ministry of Education /General /General	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.102	Support	Supports all Ministry of Education Designations listed in the Plan's Designation section and Shown in the plan Maps except as shown below in submission points.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
MEDU - Ministry of Education /General /General	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.103	Amend	Amend MEDU-1 as it is incorrectly listed. Requests it is amended to match the designation confirmation dated 6 August 2019.	Seeks to amend plan as follows.  "Lots 36 and 37 and Pt Lots 35 and 38 Deeds Plan 120 Taradale contained in  Gazette Notice 1967 page <del>1212</del> 1312"	Open Submission
MEDU - Ministry of Education /Ministry of Education Designations /	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.104	Amend	Considers the schools access way has not been included within the designation, which is located on the eastern boundary of the MEDU-2 designation. The access way is an important part of the school's operation. Therefore, the Ministry requests that the access way be included within the designation (Legal Description Lot 2 DP 22229). The Ministry is the owner of Lot 2 DP 22229.	Seeks to amend MEDU-2, so that the designation be extended to include the whole of the school's driveway.	Open Submission
MEDU - Ministry of Education /Ministry of Education Designations /	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.105	Amend	Considers MEDU-3 title is inaccurately identified as "Central School" the Ministry requests that the proper name of the school is used here "Napier Central School".	Seeks to amend to read "MEDU-3: Napier Central School".	Open Submission
MEDU - Ministry of Education /Ministry of Education Designations /	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.106	Amend	Considers that MEDU is missing an allotment from its description. "Pt Lot 1 DP 4206 contained in Gazette Notice 1958 page 1810" needs to be added to the site identifier in accordance with the Ministry's confirmation notice dated 6 August 2019. The missing allotment from the description is shown as designated on the maps. The Ministry requests the following amendments are made to the proposed site identifiers to match the Council Maps.	Seeks to amend the following:  "21 Arnold Street, Onekawa  · Pt Lot 1 DP 4206 contained in Gazette Notice 1958 page 1810 · Pt Lots 30-37 DP 4219 contained in Gazette Notice 1958 page 1810 Lot 26 DP 11015 contained in Gazette Notice 1985 page 1157	Open Submission
MEDU - Ministry of Education /Ministry of Education Designations /	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.107	Amend	Considers an allotment on the north-west side of Pirimai School has not been included within the designation extent (Lot 1 Deposited Plan 11689). The Ministry requests that the designation boundary be adjust only include Lot 1 DP 11689 (79 Bill Hercock Street) and Section 1 SO 539821 (3A Allen Berry Avenue) as outlined in red, and remove all other lots. The Ministry also requests the site identifier description be amended to match these changes.	Seeks to amend so that the designation boundary be adjust only include Lot 1 DP 11689 (79 Bill Hercock Street) and Section 1 SO 539821 (3A Allen Berry Avenue) and remove all other lots. Also requests the site identifier description be amended to match these changes.	Open Submission
MEDU - Ministry of Education /Ministry of Education Designations /	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.108	Amend	Considers MEDU-23 is missing some correct site identifier details.	Seek to amend to read " <u>50</u> Murphy Road, Taradale"	Open Submission
MEDU - Ministry of Education /Ministry of Education Designations /	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.109	Amend	Considers the designation purpose is inaccurately reading "Education purposes –". The Ministry requests the removal of the hyphen for tidiness and consistency with the other designations.	Seeks to amend to read "Education purposes", with removal of the hyphen.	Open Submission
MEDU - Ministry of Education /Ministry of Education Designations /	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.110	Amend	Considers the designation purpose is inaccurately reading "Education purposes – Parkside Christian SDA School". The Ministry requests the removal of the additional information for consistency with the other designations.	Seeks to Amend to read:  Education purposes— <del>Parkside Christian SDA School</del>	Open Submission
MEDU - Ministry of Education /Ministry of Education Designations /	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.111	Amend	Considers a section from the northern portion of the site was missed from the designation. The Ministry requests that the designation boundary is reduced to the left to sit along the fence line.	Seeks to amend the designation boundary to be reduced to the left to sit along the fence line.  Refer to full submission for details.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NZTA - Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency /General /General	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.154	Amend	Supports the inclusion of all the New Zealand Transport Agency state highway designations in the designation schedule, subject to the correction of minor errors (Refer specific detail in submission below. Note, wording to be deleted is struck through and wording to be added is underlined).  Our legal name as a requiring authority is the New Zealand Transport Agency and as should be recorded as such in the Proposed District Plan.	Amend wording in designation schedule as outlined below.  Amend name of requiring authority to read: " <del>Waka Kotahi</del> New Zealand Transport Agency"	Open Submission
NZTA - Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency /Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency Designations /	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.155	Amend	Supports the inclusion of NZTA-1 – NZTA-4, however for clarity and consistency it is recommended to amend the wording of the Designation Purpose to be consistent with other state highway designations around the country, and as per the advice NZTA lodged with Council on 22 March 2023.	Amend wording of Designation Purpose of NZTA-1 – NZTA-4 to read:  <del>To undertake construction, maintenance, operation, use and improvement of the state highway network and associated infrastructure.</del>  <del>To construct, operate, maintain, and improve a state highway and associated infrastructure.</del>  <u>To construct, operate, maintain, and improve a state highway, cycleway and/or shared path, and associated infrastructure.</u>	Open Submission
NZTA - Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency /Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency Designations /	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.156	Amend	Supports the inclusion of NZTA-1 – NZTA-4, however for clarity and consistency it is recommended to make a minor amendment to the wording of the Site Identifier for each designation to be consistent with other state highway designations around the country, and as per the advice NZTA lodged with Council on 22 March 2023.	Amend wording of Site Identifier of NZTA-1 – NZTA-4 to read:  State Highway 2 from the Hastings District <del>Council boundary</del> <u>boundary to in</u> the north to the Hastings District <del>Council boundary</del> <u>boundary to in</u> the south.  State Highway 5 from the Hastings District <del>Council</del> boundary in the west to the intersection with State Highway 2 in the east.  State Highway 50 from the entrance to Napier Port Gate 1 on Breakwater Road in the north to the boundary with Hastings District <del>Council</del> in the south.  State Highway 51 from the intersection with State Highways 2 and 50 in the west (Taradale Road roundabout) to the boundary with Hastings City <del>Council</del> in the south.	Open Submission
NZTA - Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency /Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency Designations /General	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.157	Amend	Supports the inclusion of NZTA-1 – NZTA-5, however for clarity and consistency it is recommended to make a minor amendment to the wording of the Lapse Date for each designation to be consistent with other state highway designations around the country.	Amend Lapse Date of NZTA-1 – NZTA-5 to read:  "Given effect to"	Open Submission
NZTA - Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency /Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency Designations /	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.158	Amend	Supports the inclusion of NZTA-5, however as NZTA-5 is currently the only designation in this area with no overlapping designations, the designation hierarchy should be amended from 'Varies' to 'Primary'.	Amend designation hierarchy NZTA-5 to read:  "Primary"	Open Submission
NZTA - Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency /Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency Designations /	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.159	Amend	Supports the inclusion of NZTA-4, however for clarity and consistency it is recommended to make a minor amendment to the text relating to limited access roads to be consistent with other state highway designations around the country, and as per the advice NZTA lodged with Council on 22 March 2023.	Amend Additional Information to read:  "Note:  The following sections of State Highway 51 are Limited Access Road, as declared under Section 88 of the Government Rounding Powers Act 1989:  • from the intersection (roundabout) with Taradale Road in the north to approximately 130m south of the roundabout on Taradale Road in the south (Gaz 1994 p 2354); • the intersection with Ellison Street in the north to the boundary with Hastings District Council in the south (Gaz 1969 p 378)."	Open Submission
NZTA - Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency /Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency Designations /	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.160	Amend	Notes that on 6 December 2023, NZTA confirmed an alteration to the underlying designation for State Highway 51. This alteration included widening the state highway designation to allow for a new roundabout to be constructed at the intersection of SH51 and Awatoto Road, Napier and minor widening at other location. Seeks to ensure this alteration is reflected in the District Planning maps.	Requests that the proposed planning maps are updated to include the updated designation geospatial shapefiles for NZTA-4 (SH51) (confirmed on 6 December 2023 and lodged with Council with the Notice of Requirement to alter the SH51 designation).	Open Submission



# TPR - Transpower New Zealand Limited

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
TPR - Transpower New Zealand Limited /Transpower New Zealand Limited Designations /	Rebecca Eng	99.82	Support	Supports the substation designation but seeks amendment to the designation boundary to reflect that sought in the designation rollover notice.	Retain the designation but amend the designation boundary line to accord with that sought in the rollover notice.	<a href="#">Open Submission</a>

# SCHEM1 - Notable Trees

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SCHEM1 - Notable Trees /SCHEM1 – Schedule of Notable Trees / Notable Trees	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.194	Amend	Considers the Schedule needs to be updated to include trees on privately owned land.	Retain currently listed trees, and undertake a review to ensure all privately owned trees meeting the relevant criteria are included.	Open Submission

# SCHEd2 - Schedule of Natural Features and Landscapes

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SCHED2 - Schedule of Natural Features and Landscapes /Schedule of Special Character Landscapes /	Ellen Robotham	198.114	Amend	<p>The Isthmus Napier Landscape Study (Draft for Consultation 2020) identified that “The Whanganui-ā-Orotū landscape – taken as a whole – is not natural enough to be considered an ‘Outstanding Natural Landscape’: It contains the airport and its associated business park, other infrastructure, and fringes of urban development.”</p> <p>The description should be updated to accurately reflect the nature of the area as a whole and that the relatively built up and urbanised character of the Airport Zone is a component of the landscape.</p>	<p>Amend Description and Landscape Values to recognise the presence of urban form within the landscape character overlay, as follows:</p> <p>Te Whanganui-ā-Orotū encompasses approximately 3800ha of reclaimed land, largely through Earthquake uplift and drainage engineering, <del>making it a significant proportion of Napier’s non-urban landscape.</del></p> <p>The landscape includes features such as the <u>Hawke’s Bay Airport and surrounding business park</u>, the lagoon’s former seabed and islands, barrier shingle spits, western shoreline and backdrop hills, Ahuriri estuary, and Mataruahou/Napier Hill.</p> <p>...</p> <p>The adjacent Westshore Wildlife Reserve and Watchman Road Reserve with brackish ponds fringed by reeds and rushes contribute to wildlife values and act as a landmark at Napier’s northern entrance <u>when arriving via the Hawke’s Bay Airport or State Highway 2.</u></p> <p>...</p> <p>The landscape features <u>Hawke’s Bay Airport and its associated business park, the fringes of urban development</u>, undulating hills, estuary margin vegetation, tidal processes, habitat value, water quality, and <u>the upper estuary provides</u> a sense of relative quietness and placidness.</p> <p>The estuary, shoreline, and backdrop hills form visual connections with other key landmarks, enhancing the overall Te Whanganui-ā-Orotū landscape.</p>	Open Submission
SCHED2 - Schedule of Natural Features and Landscapes /SCHED2 - Natural Features and Landscapes Schedule /General	Dr. Chantal Pagel Natasha Sitarz	289.81	Amend	<p>Considers the s32 report notes that the Council commissioned a Landscape Assessment Study from Isthmus. Forest &amp; Bird has been unable to locate that Study on the Council website. Forest &amp; Bird notes that the Plan does not include any ONLs, and only one ONF. If the Isthmus Study identified any further outstanding areas, these should be included in the plan.</p>	<p>Seeks to include any ONLs and ONFs identified in the Isthmus Study in the plan, that have not been already carried through to the plan.</p>	Open Submission

# SCHE3 - Historic heritage items

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SCHE3 - Historic heritage items /SCHE3 - Heritage Items Schedule /34  Napier Girls' High School Main Block	Dibley Alan	28.1	Oppose	Napier Girls' High School (NGHS) is designated for Education Purposes under s176 of the Resource Management Act (RMA), and therefore the Ministry of Education is not required to give effect to or consider the rules of the District Plan. Considers that scheduling of the exterior of the Main Block building as a heritage items in the District Plan would likely cause confusion and raised expectations for the community.	Delete the NGHS Main Block building from SCHE3 Historic Heritage Items.	Open Submission
SCHE3 - Historic heritage items /SCHE3 - Heritage Items Schedule /185  Rita Angus' Family House	Dallas Knight	35.1	Oppose	The submitter seeks to remove 2 Milton Terrace, Napier from SCHE3 Historic Heritage Items Schedule.	The submitter seeks to remove 2 Milton Terrace, Napier from SCHE3 Historic Heritage Items Schedule.	Open Submission
SCHE3 - Historic heritage items /SCHE3 - Heritage Items Schedule /185  Rita Angus' Family House	Douglas Knight	36.1	Oppose	The submitter seeks to remove 2 Milton Terrace Napier from SCHE3 Historic Heritage Items Schedule.	The submitter seeks to remove 2 Milton Terrace Napier from SCHE3 Historic Heritage Items Schedule.	Open Submission
SCHE3 - Historic heritage items /SCHE3 - Heritage Items Schedule /107  House	John Buck	42.1	Oppose	The submitter submits that the two adjoining properties they own have significant value in terms of redevelopment potential, and that the heritage report prepared for the property only attributes heritage value to the facade of the building on the Hardinge Road frontage. The interior of 24 Hardinge Road has been extensively modified over the previous years. Concerns are expressed in relation to the length of time taken to acquire resource consents. Hardinge Road consists of a mixed typology of houses with no consistent pattern of heritage or architectural merit.	The submitter seeks to remove 24 Hardinge Road Napier from SCHE3 Historic Heritage Items Schedule.	Open Submission
SCHE3 - Historic heritage items /SCHE3 - Heritage Items Schedule /198  Houses	Donna Cullen	71.1	Oppose	Remove the Seaview houses group listing from SCHE3. Considers the heritage listing for the Seaview Terrace group of houses to place a burden of the community on the home owners, with no benefit to the owners.	Remove the Seaview Terrace group of houses from SCHE3 Historic Heritage Items and Groups Schedule.	Open Submission
SCHE3 - Historic heritage items /SCHE3 - Heritage Items Schedule /12  St John the Evangelist/Waiapu Cathedral, Cathedral of Saint John the Evangelist	Steve Orme	153.1	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of the Waiapu Cathedral as a Group A Heritage Item in SCHE3 Historic Heritage Items and/or amendments to Policy HH-P7, Rule HH-R10 and assessment criteria (dealt with as separate submission points). Further detail provided in the full submission.	Delete the Waiapu Cathedral (HH Ref. 12) from SCHE3.	Open Submission
SCHE3 - Historic heritage items /SCHE3 - Heritage Items Schedule /17  Ormond Chapel	Steve Orme	153.2	Oppose	Seeks to remove the Ormond Chapel from SCHE3 Historic Heritage Schedule due to its registration with Heritage New Zealand and the limitations the scheduling places on necessary upgrades (refer to the full submission for more detail).	Remove the Ormond Chapel (PDP Ref no. 17) from SCHE3.	Open Submission
SCHE3 - Historic heritage items	Tania Diack	191.1	Amend	Item #100 Petane Grange, located at 45 Eskdale Drive, was significantly impacted by Cyclone Gabrielle and is located within a Category 3 site, meaning it is unsafe for ongoing residential use and occupation. Demolition would require resource consent. It is therefore sought to either remove the item from the heritage listing, or alternatively, amend the policies and assessment criteria for demolition of heritage items impacted by natural hazards as sought in the following submission points.	Delete Item#100 Petane Grange from Schedule 3 – Historic heritage items, or alternative relief.	Open Submission
SCHE3 - Historic heritage items /SCHE3 - Heritage Items Schedule /15  Houses	Luke Dodd	201.1	Oppose	Opposes the historic listing status for the houses in Carnell St due to the tight restrictions on property owners from this scheduling. The change to high density residential zoning in surrounding streets will impact on the character of these houses. There is insufficient consistency between the houses to be recognised by a passer by as having heritage significance.	Remove the heritage listing for the 7 houses in Carnell Street scheduled as historic heritage.	Open Submission
SCHE3 - Historic heritage items /SCHE3 - Heritage Items Schedule /20  La Grande Maison (Mission Estate Winery) & observatory base	Peter Holley	234.6	Oppose	Heritage item 20, 'La Grande Maison (Mission Estate Winery) & observatory base' should be deleted from SCHE3 - Historic heritage items. These items are not included in any heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Schedule and are adequately protected by other mechanisms. The observatory base is a recorded archaeological site, the building referenced as La Grande Masion is protected by PDP and provisions in PREC5-Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct Chapters. The building has been significant altered overtime. The building is a flagship of the mission estate and is not in the commercial interest of MHGL to remove, MHGL would like to be able to make alterations to the building as required and have been doing so since 1910 without requiring consent.	Seeks to delete Heritage item 20 as follows: <del>20</del> La Grande Maison (Mission Estate Winery) & observatory base 198 Church Road Part Lot 1 DP 27138 B	Open Submission

# SCHE3 - Historic heritage items

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
<p>SCHE3 - Historic heritage items /SCHE3 - Heritage Items Schedule /15</p> <p>Houses</p>	Gary Jack French	251.3	Amend	Amend High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) to exclude Carnell Street. Finds it ironic that HRZ will be in Carnell Street while also imposing Category B Built Heritage upon houses 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 & 14 Carnell Street. the heritage value of the street will be compromised.Suspects the granting of Heritage status is a mechanism to soften HRZ. Granting of Category B Built Heritage status imposes limitations and costs to property owners. NCC Cannot have both Heritage housing adjacent to HRZ.Building up rather than out needs to be controlled and done aesthetically. With public input during the RMA process on the basis that existing civil services have capacity to handle greater demands HRZ will impose.The development of HRZ in Carnell Street will have the following detrimental impacts on the environment and current residents, devalue the heritage value of numbers 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 & 14 in Carnell Street, create more shade, sunlight, privacy, noise, parking, visual look of homes, law and order, and health and safety risk for students.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
<p>SCHE3 - Historic heritage items /SCHE3 - Heritage Items Schedule /198</p> <p>Houses</p>	Sue and Howard Dick and Pilgrim	261.2	Oppose	<p>Seeks to delete Item 198 from Schedule 3 of the PDP for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is no benefit to the owners and will make maintenance more costly and difficult</li> <li>- Ratepayers should contribute to the cost of retention and maintenance of the buildings if there is a benefit to them of the buildings retention</li> <li>- None of the buildings have been demolished in over 140 years. With the majority of homes now with an owner-occupier status, those owning the homes retain them because they value their heritage status</li> <li>- A heritage status may make the homes difficult to sell</li> <li>- Initially attracted to the policy that prevented demolition, however now consider there is no need for this given each of the properties value and size, and the lack of evidence of a developer looking top purchase multiple properties making the risk of demolition and redevelopment low</li> </ul>	Seek removal of Schedule 3 item 198 from the Napier City Proposed District Plan	Open Submission
<p>SCHE3 - Historic heritage items /SCHE3 - Heritage Items Schedule /12</p> <p>St John the Evangelist/Waiapu Cathedral, Cathedral of Saint John the Evangelist</p>	Robin Gwynn	262.2	Oppose	Notes concern about the future of the Cathedral in Napier, highlighting frequent changes to engineering requirements and escalating costs. Notes parallels with the situation faced by Christchurch Cathedral and emphasizes the close connection between Napier's identity and its cathedral. Considers that there is a lack of consultation with the public regarding the Cathedral's heritage status and the absence of input from regular users of the building. Notes the disparity in population sizes between Christchurch and Napier and questions the financial sustainability of maintaining the cathedral. Seeks a collaborative approach involving the Council, churches, Regional Council, and citizens to find the best solution for the Cathedral and the city. Considers the importance of addressing climate change and suggests the Cathedral could lead by example, potentially through the installation of solar panels. Considers that the recent decisions by the Napier City Council are disappointing and warns of the potential consequences of neglecting the Cathedral, emphasizing the need for a common vision and city-wide approach to safeguard its future. Refer to original submission for full reasons.	Seeks a collaborative approach involving the Council, churches, Regional Council, and citizens to find the best solution for the Cathedral and the city. Submitter provides a summary of the issues highlighted and considers that there has not been enough consultation and discussion before actions have been taken. Notes the priority of climate change matters, followed by the future of the Cathedral. Notes the roading and traffic issues discussed. Considers that these challenges need thought, prayer, joint action and new approaches. No provision-specific relief sought. Refer to original submission for full details.	Open Submission
<p>SCHE3 - Historic heritage items /SCHE3 - Heritage Items Schedule /General</p>	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.177	Amend	Considers the SCHE3 - Heritage Items Schedule heading should be amended as it would be better to refer to HNZPT by the full acronym, rather than 'HNZ'. Also, the NZ Heritage List Categories should be in Arabic numerals '1' and '2' rather than the Roman 'i' and 'ii'.	Amend the SCHE3 - Heritage Items Schedule as follows:Sched 3 - Heritage Items Schedule: <del>HNZ-HNZPT</del> Category Replace 'i' and 'ii' with '1 and '2'.	Open Submission
<p>SCHE3 - Historic heritage items /SCHE3 - Heritage Items Schedule /14</p> <p>Borough Council Chambers (Former)</p>	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.178	Support	HNZPT supports the inclusion of Borough Council Chambers (Former) Ref. No. 14 to the Schedule.	Retain Borough Council Chambers (Former) Ref. No. 14 to the SCHE3 - Historic heritage items Schedule as notified.	Open Submission

# SCHEd3 - Historic heritage items

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SCHEd3 - Historic heritage items /SCHEd3 - Heritage Items Schedule /31  Trinity Methodist Church	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.179	Support	Supports SCHEd3 - Historic heritage item 31 - Trinity Methodist Church as previously requested by HNZPT noting that this church is identified as Group A.	Retain SCHEd3 - Historic heritage Ref. No. 31 - Trinity Methodist Church as notified.	Open Submission
SCHEd3 - Historic heritage items /SCHEd3 - Heritage Items Schedule /61  The Master's Lodge (House)	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.180	Support	Supports the inclusion of The Master's Lodge (House) Ref. No. 61 at 10 Elizabeth Road (Pt Lot 1 DP 4478) in SCHEd3 - Historic heritage items.	Retain The Master's Lodge (House) Ref. No. 61 at 10 Elizabeth Road (Pt Lot 1 DP 4478) in SCHEd3 - Historic heritage items as notified.	Open Submission
SCHEd3 - Historic heritage items /SCHEd3 - Heritage Items Schedule /191 NZ Industrial Gases Group including: · NZ Industrial Gases Cast Iron Fence & Gate (currently in storage) · NZ Industrial Gases Bulk Store and Office Building	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.181	Support	Supports the inclusion of NZ Industrial Gases Group Ref. No. 191 at 11 Owen Street (Lots 673, 674 & 675 DP 2311) to SCHEd3 - Historic heritage items.	Retain NZ Industrial Gases Group Ref. No. 191 at 11 Owen Street (Lots 673, 674 & 675 DP 2311) to SCHEd3 - Historic heritage items as notified.	Open Submission
SCHEd3 - Historic heritage items /General /General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.182	Amend	Considers that SCHEd3 - Historic heritage items should be amended to include Ōtātara Homestead, Eastern Institute of Technology (EIT) that is a nominated place for inclusion in the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangī Kōrero. This Homestead, located on a hill between Taradale's Ōtātara Pā Historic Reserve and the EIT Hawke's Bay main campus area, has buildings and features dating from the property's late Nineteenth-century farming and domestic use to its late Twentieth century educational and community functions. This place has sufficient heritage value to be entered in SCHEd3.	Amend SCHEd3 - Historic heritage items to include Ōtātara Homestead as follows: <u>Address: 501 Gloucester Street Taradale</u> <u>Legal Description: Pt Lot 3 DP 4846</u>	Open Submission
SCHEd3 - Historic heritage items /General /General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.183	Amend	Considers SCHEd3 - Historic heritage items should be amended to include Hetley Building, Eastern Institute of Technology, is a nominated place for inclusion in the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangī Kōrero. Constructed between 1975 and 1978, the Hetley Building is a regionally significant building at EIT Hawke's Bay campus in Taradale. This building is important because it commemorates the contribution of Frederic St Arnaud and Margaret Hetley to the creation of New Zealand's first community college. This place is considered to have sufficient heritage value to be entered in SCHEd3.	Amend SCHEd3 - Historic heritage items by including Hetley Building as follows: <u>Address: 501 Gloucester Street</u> <u>Legal Description: Pt Lot 5 DP 4846</u>	Open Submission
SCHEd3 - Historic heritage items /General /General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.184	Amend	Considers that SCHEd3 - Historic heritage items should be amended with the addition of Williams and Kettle Limited No. 4 Wool Store (Former) that is a proposal for inclusion on New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangī Kōrero. Williams and Kettle Limited No.4 Wool Store (Former) was one of the first Napier buildings rebuilt in 1931 after the destructive Hawke's Bay earthquake. This building has historical significance because of its association with important and longstanding New Zealand wool exporters, Williams and Kettle Limited who were based at Port Ahuriri from the company's beginning. This place has sufficient heritage value to be entered in SCHEd3. It is acknowledged that this building is a contributory site within the Iron Pot Heritage Overlay, however it is the view of HNZPT that the heritage values of the place warrant its inclusion in SCHEd3.	Amend SCHEd3 - Historic heritage items by including the following: <u>Williams and Kettle Limited No. 4 Wool Store (Former)</u> <u>Address: 9 Riddell Street</u> <u>Legal Description: Lot 120 DEEDS 781</u>	Open Submission
SCHEd3 - Historic heritage items /General /General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.185	Amend	Considers SCHEd3 - Historic heritage items should be amended by including Eames Building at 44 Dickens Street that is identified as a contributing building within the Napier City Heritage Area (New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero List number 7022). Heritage New Zealand is unaware of any changes to this place which would have substantially diminished its values since it was added to the List in 1995 as part of the historic area. This building should be considered for inclusion in Schedule 3.	Amend SCHEd3 - Historic heritage items with the addition of: <u>Eames Building, 44 Dickens Street.</u>	Open Submission

## SCHED3 - Historic heritage items

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SCHED3 - Historic heritage items /General /General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.186	Amend	Considers that SCHED3 - Historic heritage items should be amended with the addition of Rayment's Garage at 143-147 Tennyson Street. It is identified as a contributing building within the Napier City Heritage Area (New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero List number 7022). Heritage New Zealand is unaware of any changes to this place which would have substantially diminished its values since it was added to the List in 1995 as part of the historic area. This building should be considered for inclusion in Schedule 3.	Amend SCHED3 - Historic heritage items with the inclusion of: <u>Rayment's Garage143-147 Tennyson Street.</u>	Open Submission

# SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Overlay and Precinct Schedule

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Overlay and Precinct Schedule	Lawrence and Kerryn Yule	112.2	Amend	Opposes the lack of a heritage protection over Vigor Brown Street.	Amend the heritage protection overlay to include Vigor Brown Street.	Open Submission
SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Overlay and Precinct Schedule /SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Overlay and Precinct Schedule	Kate Graham	119.7	Amend	Amend Schedule 4 to include the section of Vigor Brown Street from the corner of Carnell Street to the north to the corner of Kennedy Road to the south.	Please amend Schedule 4 - to include the section of Vigor Brown Street from the corner of Carnell Street to the north to the corner of Kennedy Road to the south.	Open Submission
SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Overlay and Precinct Schedule	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.63	Amend	For clarity, include legal descriptions for 187 and 189 Shakespeare Road (Non-Contributory Sites).	Add the legal descriptions to the Tram Shelter Historic Heritage Overlay table:  187 Shakespeare Road – Lot 2 DP 509564 189 Shakespeare Road – Lot 2 DP 509564	Open Submission
SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Overlay and Precinct Schedule /General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.187	Support	Supports SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Overlay and Precinct Schedule contents as it is useful to include a description of each area, applicable heritage values, and clearly identified contributory properties.	Retain SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Overlay and Precinct Schedule contents / provisions as notified.	Open Submission



# SCHE5 - Archeological Sites

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SCHED5 - Archeological Sites /General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.188	Support	Considers that SCHED5 - Archaeological Sites is supported as an information tool, which includes all recorded archaeological sites with Napier City at the time of notification. However, by way of an amendment, it would be beneficial for Plan users to have more guidance in this Section of the Plan on the requirements if there is a recorded archaeological site on their property, or which might be impacted by development.	Retain SCHED5 - Archaeological Sites with the following amendment:  <u>Advice Note:</u>  <u>Schedule 5 contains all archaeological sites recorded by the New Zealand Archaeological Association, at the time of notification of this Plan. The Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 protects all archaeological sites regardless of whether or not they have been recorded by New Zealand Archaeological Association. Plan users are advised to contact Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga for advice on the archaeological authority process.</u>	Open Submission

# SCHE6 - Amenity Precinct Values and Attributes Statements

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
SCHE6 - Amenity Precinct Values and Attributes Statements /PREC3 - Napier Hill/Mataruahou Amenity Precinct /	Phil Stickney	263.75	Support	Amend the amenity statement for PREC3 as it makes no reference to the currently vacant (and recently demolished) buildings in the Precinct, and the larger sites which have a different quality and character to the majority of the Precinct. It is considered necessary to include references to these in the Amenity Statement as that is considered one of the key elements of the Precinct and is not currently reflected in the Statement.	Add additional text and cite the former uses of specified sites and their character in the context of the balance of the Precinct.	<a href="#">Open Submission</a>

# APP1 - Airport Height Control Designation

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
APP1 - Airport Height Control Designation /Description of Airport Height Control Designation	Sera Chambers	150.50	Oppose	Opposes designation on the basis that the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners should be the guiding principle and that adjoining landowners should be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Seeks that adjoining landowners are notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Open Submission
APP1 - Airport Height Control Designation /Description of Airport Height Control Designation /	Sera Chambers	150.51	Oppose	Opposes designation on the basis that the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners should be the guiding principle and that adjoining landowners should be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Open Submission
APP1 - Airport Height Control Designation /Description of Airport Height Control Designation	Sera Chambers	150.52	Oppose	Opposes designation on the basis that the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners should be the guiding principle and that adjoining landowners should be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Open Submission
APP1 - Airport Height Control Designation /(a) Take-off Climb and Approach Surfaces for Main Runway 16-34 /	Sera Chambers	150.53	Oppose	Opposes designation on the basis that the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners should be the guiding principle and that adjoining landowners should be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Open Submission
APP1 - Airport Height Control Designation /(a) Take-off Climb and Approach Surfaces for Main Runway 16-34 /	Sera Chambers	150.54	Oppose	Opposes designation on the basis that the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners should be the guiding principle and that adjoining landowners should be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Open Submission
APP1 - Airport Height Control Designation /(b) Take-Off Climb and Approach Surfaces for Cross Wind Runway 07-25 /	Sera Chambers	150.55	Oppose	Opposes designation on the basis that the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners should be the guiding principle and that adjoining landowners should be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Open Submission
APP1 - Airport Height Control Designation /(c) Transitional Side Surfaces Main Runway 16-34 /	Sera Chambers	150.56	Oppose	Opposes designation on the basis that the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners should be the guiding principle and that adjoining landowners should be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Open Submission
APP1 - Airport Height Control Designation /(d) Transitional Side Surfaces Cross Runway 07-25 /	Sera Chambers	150.57	Oppose	Opposes designation on the basis that the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners should be the guiding principle and that adjoining landowners should be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Open Submission
APP1 - Airport Height Control Designation /(e) Inner Horizontal Surface /	Sera Chambers	150.58	Oppose	Opposes designation on the basis that the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners should be the guiding principle and that adjoining landowners should be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Open Submission
APP1 - Airport Height Control Designation /(f) Conical Surface /	Sera Chambers	150.59	Oppose	Opposes designation on the basis that the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners should be the guiding principle and that adjoining landowners should be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Open Submission
APP1 - Airport Height Control Designation /(f) Conical Surface /	Sera Chambers	150.60	Oppose	Opposes designation on the basis that the enjoyment of property rights by affected landowners should be the guiding principle and that adjoining landowners should be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and able to have their say about the impacts and mitigations within the designation.	Open Submission
APP1 - Airport Height Control Designation /Description of Airport Height Control Designation /General	Ellen Robotham	198.117	Support	These maps help give effect to designation HBAL-1 and protects the Airport and its function as a regionally significant infrastructure and Lifeline Utility.	Retain as notified with minor grammatical amendments, including those suggested below. Amend to correct spelling mistakes e.g. 3. General Description, 3rd para "The inner horizontal surface extend outward horizontally from the outer edges of the main runway..."	Open Submission

## APP2 - Redclyffe Substation 12m Setback

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
APP2 - Redclyffe Substation 12m Setback /APP2 - Redclyffe Substation 12m Setback	Rebecca Eng	99.83	Oppose	Transpower is not pursuing the substation setback buffer and therefore supports its deletion from the plan. The setback is not required on the basis of the rural zoning.	Delete Schedule A, Appendix 2.	<a href="#">Open Submission</a>

## APP3 - Access Sight Distance Lines

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
APP3 - Access Sight Distance Lines /APP3 - Access Sight Distance Lines	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.163	Oppose	Opposes and seeks longer sight distances, especially for the higher speeds and that the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure should align with the New Zealand Transport Agency Planning Policy Manual: Appendix 5B – Accessway standards and guidelines, Table App5B/1. See Appendix 2.	Amend to standards in alignment with New Zealand Transport Agency Planning Policy Manual: Appendix 5B Accessway standards and guidelines, Section 5B/1 Sight distances.	Open Submission

# APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan /Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements	Kay Foley	97.5	Amend	Considers that in APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan 2. Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements (e) and (h) that there should be greater clarity around regular Council peer-reviewing of monitoring and a requirement that the Port act upon this peer reviewing as a requirement of its monitoring and reporting.	Inferred relief requested. Amend 2. Minimum Monitoring and Report Requirements to include regular audits with a requirement for the Port Operators to offer mitigation in response to the audit recommendations. Amend to include the Port Noise Liaison Committee and peer review of the current port noise contour map at the request of residents or the Port Noise Liaison Committee in the event of a dispute in accordance with its monitoring responsibilities under section 35 of the Resource Management Act 1991.	Open Submission
APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan /APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan /This appendix prescribes the matters that the Port Operator shall include in the Port Noise Management Plan required under rule NOISE-R11 and standard NOISE-S3. It also sets out minimum noise modelling, monitoring, reporting, and audit requirements.	Kay Foley	97.7	Amend	Considers that APP5(a) - Port Noise Management Plan. 2. h. Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements should reference the Port doing field verification identified in the Port Management Plan as agreed upon by the Port's acoustic consultant, Napier City Council AND the Port Noise Liaison Committee with Napier City Council also undertaking noise measurements / peer review at the request of residents or the PNLC.	Inferred relief requested to Amend APP5(a) - Port Noise Management Plan. 2. h. Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements as follows: h. To ensure the accuracy of the current port noise contour map the Port Operator shall undertake field verification of calculated sound exposure levels of port noise at monitoring points identified in the Port Noise Management Plan. These monitoring points shall be as decided on a six monthly basis by agreement between the Port Operator's acoustic consultant, and the Napier City Council and the Port Noise Liaison Committee. The Napier City Council may also undertake noise measurements and / or obtain a peer review of the current port noise contour map at the request of residents or the Port Noise Liaison Committee in the event of a dispute in accordance with its monitoring responsibilities under section 35 of the Resource Management Act 1991.	Open Submission
APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan /Minimum port noise management plan provisions /	Alan Petersen	187.20	Amend	Submission 20 – p1 – 1. d. Procedures for recommendation of the Port Noise Liaison Committee to be considered and determined by the Port Operator. This is not acceptable. The Port Noise Liaison Committee is a collaborative body. The procedures for recommendations should be done by the Committee.	The procedures for recommendations should be done by the Committee.	Open Submission
APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan /Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements	Alan Petersen	187.21	Amend	The Port Operator shall maintain at its expense permanent sound level monitoring equipment operating 24 hours a day 7 days a week and shall arrange for a suitably qualified person to perform continuous monitoring of noise emanating from port activities to ensure that the provisions specified in NOISE-S3 are complied with. The monitoring equipment shall as a minimum record noise level statistics in 15-minute periods so that the Leq, Lmax and L90 can be determined for each 15-minute period. In addition, the monitoring equipment shall be capable of recording the actual sound when a pre-set threshold or set of thresholds is exceeded, so that the sound can be listened to at a later time. All recorded data shall be kept for a minimum of six months, and be available if requested by Napier City Council. Submission 21 – p1 – 2. a. last sentence --requested by Napier City Council or others on the Port Noise Liaison Committee.	Submission 21 – p1 – 2. a. last sentence --requested by Napier City Council or others on the Port Noise Liaison Committee.	Open Submission
APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan /Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements	Alan Petersen	187.22	Amend	Submission 22 – at the appropriate sub-paragraph “a” to “l” allow for members of the Port Noise Liaison Committee to obtain noise recordings from the monitoring station(s).	At the appropriate sub-paragraph “a” to “l” allow for members of the Port Noise Liaison Committee to obtain noise recordings from the monitoring station(s).	Open Submission
APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan /Minimum port noise management plan provisions	Grant Russell	202.82	Amend	Considers APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan should be amended to correct a missing close bracket at Clause 1. Minimum port noise management plan provisions j.	Amend APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan Clause 1. Minimum port noise management plan provisions j. as follows: j. A Port Noise Contour Map (See Appendix 5(a) 2. ) below(Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission

# APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan /Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements	Grant Russell	202.83	Amend	Considers APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan should be amended by deleting unrequired text to avoid conflict and maintain consistency with operative rules; continuous monitoring of noise is completed 24/7 by the noise monitor – not a “suitably qualified person”; additional text simply reflects the existing Bluff hill noise monitor settings – which is unnecessarily prescriptive, and duplicates information in 2b-d; and the operative requirement for a Port Noise Contour Map for the purposes of determining Noise Mitigation offers is now separated out as part 2f.	Amend APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan as follows:2. Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements The minimum monitoring and reporting requirements are as follows: The Port Operator shall maintain at its expense permanent sound level monitoring equipment operating 24 hours a day 7 days a week and shall arrange for a suitably qualified person to perform continuous monitoring of noise emanating from port activities to ensure that the provisions specified in NOISE-S3 are complied with. <del>The monitoring equipment shall as a minimum record noise level statistics in 15 minute periods so that the Leq, Lmax and L90 can be determined for each 15 minute period. In addition, the monitoring equipment shall be capable of recording the actual sound when a pre-set threshold or set of thresholds is exceeded, so that the sound can be listened to at a later time. All recorded data shall be kept for a minimum of six months, and be available if requested by Napier City Council.</del> (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan /Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements	Grant Russell	202.84	Amend	Considers APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan should be amended as detailed annual reports have always been provided to inform the noise contours for the next year. We have supplemented this with monitoring results of specific matters at Port Noise Liaison Committee meetings if required. We can provide formal interim targeted reporting if required, but based on experience to date, it would provide limited value.	Amend APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan as follows: 2. Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements b. The Port Operator shall provide the results of the permanent sound level monitoring to the Council and the Port Noise Liaison Committee showing LAeq, LAFmax, calculated Ldn (5-day) sound exposure and all attended LAFmax levels on a six-monthly an annual basis. <del>The results shall be in summary form showing Leq, Lmax and calculated Ldn levels, within two weeks of the end of each month.</del> Significant port noise emissions shall be highlighted and correlated with port activity and wind speed and wind direction data.	Open Submission
APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan /Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements	Grant Russell	202.85	Oppose	Opposes APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan 2. Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements Clause c. to maintain consistency with operative rules and avoid duplication / conflict with parts 2a and 2h. Regardless, NOISE-S3 requires assessment in accordance with the Port Noise Standard NZS6809. WHO guidelines are not considered relevant.	Delete APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan 2. Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements Clause c. in its entirety as notified.	Open Submission
APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan /Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements	Grant Russell	202.86	Oppose	Opposes APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan 2. Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements Clause d. to maintain consistency with operative rules and avoid duplication / conflict with parts 2a and 2h.	Delete APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan 2. Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements Clause d. in its entirety.	Open Submission
APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan /Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements	Grant Russell	202.87	Oppose	Opposes APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan 2. Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements Clause e. to maintain consistency with operative rules and avoid duplication / conflict with the existing peer review requirements retained in Clause 2. h.	Delete APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan 2. Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements Clause e. in its entirety.	Open Submission
APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan /Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements	Grant Russell	202.88	Support	Supports APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan 1. Minimum port noise management plan provisions j. Port Noise Contour Map based on the sound level monitoring measured in 2. Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements Clause f. and the port noise contours shall be modelled at 1 dB intervals from 55 dBA Ldn (5-day). This Current Port Noise Contour Map is to be attached to the Port Noise Management Plan and updated annually at the expense of the Port Operator. The current Port Noise Contour Map determines the Port Noise Mitigation Offers in accordance with Appendix 5(b).	Retain APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan references to Port Noise Contour Map in 2. Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements Clause f.	Open Submission
APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan /Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements	Grant Russell	202.89	Oppose	Opposes APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan 2. Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements Clause f. as there is unnecessary duplication with Clause i that presents potential duplication version conflicts.	Delete APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan 2. Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements Clause g. in its entirety.	Open Submission

# APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan /Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements /	Grant Russell	202.90	Amend	Considers APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan 2. Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements Clause h. should be amended as the Port Napier noise monitoring annual reviews have shown the noise contours remain consistent unless major change occurs thus, the need (and cost) should not be frivolously assigned.	Amend APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan 2. Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements Clause h. as follows: <del>To ensure the accuracy of the current port noise contour map the Port Operator shall undertake field verification of calculated sound exposure levels of port noise at monitoring points identified in the Port Noise Management Plan after construction and/or significant variation in operating mode and when triggered by any corresponding consent requirements. These monitoring points shall be as decided by agreement between the Port Operator's acoustic consultant and the Napier City Council.</del> The Napier City Council may also undertake noise measurements and/or obtain a peer review of the current port noise contour map in accordance with its monitoring responsibilities under section 35 of the Resource Management Act 1991.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan /Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements /	Grant Russell	202.91	Amend	Considers APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan 2. Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements should be amended to reinstate last sentence to maintain consistency with operative rules. It provides a distinction between an outlier event and a representative event that requires further action.	Amend APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan 2. Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements Clause i. as follows:In the event that sound level monitoring indicates that port noise may be exceeding 65 dB Ldn (5-day) or 65 dB LAeq (15min, 10pm - 7am) at any point beyond the Inner Port Noise Overlay shown on the planning maps the exceedance shall be recorded, investigated, and reported to the Port Noise Liaison Committee. <u>If the exceedance is confirmed on more than three occasions (more than 24 hours apart) during any rolling 12 month period the noise sensitive activity shall be included on the list for acoustic treatment in accordance with Appendix 5(b).</u>	Open Submission
APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan /Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements /	Grant Russell	202.92	Support	Supports APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan 2. Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements Clause j. When a noise complaint is received the Port Operator will advise the Napier City Council within 5 workings days. When a noise complaint is received by Napier City Council they will advise the Port Operator within 5 working days.	Retain APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan 2. Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements Clause j. in its entirety as notified.	Open Submission
APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan /Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements /	Grant Russell	202.93	Amend	Amend APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan 2. Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements Clause k. as it is unnecessary to provide six- monthly complaints register to Napier City Council (NCC) as the council are part of the Noise Liaison Committee (NLC) and complaints are forwarded directly to council as they occur.	Amend APP5 (a) - Port Noise Management Plan 2. Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements Clause k. as follows: The Port Operator shall maintain a register of noise complaints and report the details of complaints and any action taken to investigate and resolve complaints to the Port Noise Liaison Committee at each meeting. <del>A copy of this register shall be provided to the Napier City Council every six months.</del>	Open Submission



# APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Offers of Acoustic Treatment - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 60 L dn (5-day) and 65 L dn (5-day)	Kay Foley	97.2	Amend	Considers that for all dwellings exposed to 60-65 dB on the Port Noise Contour Map and requiring acoustic treatment to achieve an indoor noise level of 40dB, that the adjusted mitigation is now inadequate with the real contribution to the affected homeowner of \$42,000 necessitating that the \$50,000 is increased to \$60,000 if GST is inclusive.	Amend APP5 (b) 2.d. Offers of Acoustic Treatment - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 60 Ldn (5-day) and 65 Ldn (5-day) as follows:d. The Port Operator / noise-sensitive activity shall both contribute 50% each of the cost of further facade improvements required to achieve the indoor design sound level (stage 3) provided that the total Port Operator contribution shall not exceed <del>\$50</del> 60,000 including GST <u>or \$50,000 excluding GST</u> (adjusted annually thereafter (indexed from 1 July 2024) using the Consumers Price Index to compensate for inflation.	Open Submission
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Offers of Acoustic Treatment 55 - 60 dB L dn (5-day) - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 55 L dn (5-day) and 60 L dn (5-day)	Kay Foley	97.3	Amend	Considers that for all dwellings exposed to 55 - 60dB on the Port Noise Contour Map and requiring acoustic treatment to achieve an indoor noise level of 40dB, that the adjusted mitigation is now inadequate with the real contribution to the affected homeowner of \$25,500 necessitating that the \$30,000 is increased to \$60,000 if GST is inclusive or else \$50,000 excluding GST.	Amend APP5 (b) 3. - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements - Offers of Acoustic Treatment 55 - 60 dB Ldn (5-day) - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 55 Ldn (5-day) and 60 Ldn (5-day) as follows:  The Port Noise Liaison Committee shall consider acoustic treatment for any noise-sensitive activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 55 dB Ldn (5-day) and 60 dB Ldn (5-day).  On request by the property owner of the noise-sensitive activity, the Port Operator shall consider contributing up to 50% of the cost of acoustic treatment/sealing to doors and windows (stage 1), and/or installation of mechanical ventilation and/or cooling (stage 2) provided that the total Port Operator contribution shall not exceed <del>\$30</del> 60,000 including GST or <del>\$50,000 excluding GST</del> (adjusted annually thereafter (indexed from 1 July 2024) using the Consumers Price Index to compensate for inflation)	Open Submission
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Obligations of the Port Operator /General	Kay Foley	97.4	Amend	Considers that APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 4. Obligations of the Port Operator needs to set a specific budget / targets in consultation with the Port Noise Liaison Committee as to the minimum number of houses / prioritisation / minimum budget, as the Port setting the budget has resulted in slow progress to date of only approximately 3 houses per year being remediated averaging approximately only \$35,000.	Inferred relief requested. Amend APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 4. Obligations of the Port Operator - Budget as follows:  The Port Operator <u>in consultation with the Port Noise Liaison Committee</u> shall allocate an annual <u>minimum</u> budget for each financial year (1 October) at the beginning of each financial year (1 October) for the implementation of Port Noise Mitigation Requirements <u>together with a minimum / prioritised targeted number of houses.</u>  The Port Operator shall <del>present</del> <u>agree upon</u> the annual budget <del>to</del> <u>with</u> the Port Noise Liaison Committee prior to the beginning of each financial year (1 October) for endorsement.	Open Submission
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements	Kay Foley	97.6	Amend	Considers that APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements should have weight in the 55dB-plus category in 2024 in the absence of a submission against that aspect.	Seeks that APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation should have weight in the 55dB-plus category in the absence of a submission against that aspect and for mitigation rules to take effect in 2024	Open Submission
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Offers of Acoustic Treatment 65 dB L dn (5-day) - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being 65 L dn (5-day)	Alan Petersen	187.23	Amend	c. The Port Operator shall contribute 100% of the cost of necessary acoustic treatment to doors and windows (stage 1), installation of mechanical ventilation and cooling (stage 2), re-instatement of painting and decorating disturbed by improvements (stage 1 and 2), and further facade improvements required to achieve the indoor design sound level (stage 3). Submission 23 – 1. c – does installation include the purchase of the mechanical ventilation and cooling unit. If not, it should.	Submission 23 – 1. c – does installation include the purchase of the mechanical ventilation and cooling unit. If not, it should.	Open Submission

# APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Offers of Acoustic Treatment - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 60 L dn (5-day) and 65 L dn (5-day)	Alan Petersen	187.24	Amend	c. The Port Operator shall contribute 100% of the cost of necessary acoustic treatment to doors and windows (stage 1), installation of mechanical ventilation and cooling (stage 2), and reinstatement of painting and decorating disturbed by improvements (stage 1 and 2) provided that the total Port Operator contribution shall not exceed \$50,000 including GST (adjusted annually thereafter (indexed from 1 July 2024) using the Consumers Price Index to compensate for inflation.	Submission 24 – 2. c – does installation include the purchase of the mechanical ventilation and cooling unit. If not, it should.	Open Submission
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Offers of Acoustic Treatment - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 60 L dn (5-day) and 65 L dn (5-day)	Alan Petersen	187.25	Amend	c. The Port Operator shall contribute 100% of the cost of necessary acoustic treatment to doors and windows (stage 1), installation of mechanical ventilation and cooling (stage 2), and reinstatement of painting and decorating disturbed by improvements (stage 1 and 2) provided that the total Port Operator contribution shall not exceed \$50,000 including GST (adjusted annually thereafter (indexed from 1 July 2024) using the Consumers Price Index to compensate for inflation. d. The Port Operator / noise-sensitive activity shall both contribute 50% each of the cost of further facade improvements required to achieve the indoor design sound level (stage 3) provided that the total Port Operator contribution shall not exceed \$50,000 including GST (adjusted annually thereafter (indexed from 1 July 2024) using the Consumers Price Index to compensate for inflation.	Submission 25 – 2.c. & d. The inflation adjustment should be based on the Construction Price Index – not the Consumers Price Index. The acoustic treatment is a construction activity.	Open Submission
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Obligations of the Port Operator / Budget	Alan Petersen	187.26	Amend	Budget – the amount should be \$250,000 per year plus the Construction Index from the date of the Environment Court decision that set this amount. The Port should be required to provide this amount until all acoustic treatment work is completed.	Budget – the amount should be \$250,000 per year plus the Construction Index from the date of the Environment Court decision that set this amount. The Port should be required to provide this amount until all acoustic treatment work is completed.	Open Submission
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Obligations of the Port Operator /Acoustic Treatment	Alan Petersen	187.27	Amend	Is the acoustic certificate to NCC a Building Act requirement? The property owners may require a Code Compliance Certificate. At a recent meeting of the Port Liaison Committee this was discussed as many houses as possible that have had acoustic treatment have not had the work completed to enable a Code Compliance Certificate to be issued by Council. This matter needs clarifying.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Obligations of the Property Owner /	Alan Petersen	187.28	Amend	Obligations of the Property Owner Submission 28 – “4” should be “5”.5 c & d. Why 50% contribution for Stage 1 to & 3. The Port as the noise creator should be contributing 100% on all mitigation work.	Obligations of the Property Owner Submission 28 – “4” should be “5”.5 c & d. Why 50% contribution for Stage 1 to & 3. The Port as the noise creator should be contributing 100% on all mitigation work.	Open Submission

# APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Offers of Acoustic Treatment 65 dB L dn (5-day) - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being 65 L dn (5-day) /General	Grant Russell	202.94	Oppose	The submitter opposes APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 1. Offers of Acoustic Treatment > 65 dB Ldn (5-day) - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being >65 Ldn (5-day)as there are no dwellings inside the >65 dB Ldn, and any future eligible dwellings will be triggered and mitigated in accordance with Parts 2 and 3 below making this subsequent requirement redundant.If retained, the Napier Port contribution must be specified. Propose a total of \$100,000 for APP5 (b) 1, APP5 (b) 2 and APP5 (b) 3 combined. Other changes enable consistency with changes sought in APP5 (b) 2.	Seeks to delete APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 1. Offers of Acoustic Treatment > 65 dB Ldn (5-day) - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being >65 Ldn (5-day)or else to amend the provisions as follows: 1. Offers of Acoustic Treatment > 65 dB Ldn (5-day) - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being >65 Ldn (5-day)a. Make an offer in writing to the owner(s) of any <u>noise sensitive activity consented prior to 16 April 2003</u> which are shown on the the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being >65 dB Ldn (5-day) to install acoustic treatment or mechanical ventilation to achieve a spatial average indoor design sound level in the existing habitable spaces of the building(s) of 40 dB Ldn (5-day) where practicable. The indoor design sound level must be achieved with all windows and doors open unless adequate means of mechanical ventilation and cooling is provided, used, and maintained in operating order. b. The offer must be made to <u>owners of</u> all noise-sensitive activities eligible in (a) above. To avoid doubt new offers must be made to <u>owners of</u> noise- sensitive activities who have previously refused the offer or if the owner(s) have changed. <del>for the noise-sensitive activity.</del> .c. The Port Operator shall contribute 100% of the cost of necessary acoustic treatment to doors and windows (stage 1), installation of mechanical ventilation and cooling (stage 2), re-instatement of painting and decorating disturbed by improvements (stage 1 and 2), and further facade improvements required to achieve the indoor design sound level (stage 3).	Open Submission
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Offers of Acoustic Treatment - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 60 L dn (5-day) and 65 L dn (5-day) /General	Grant Russell	202.95	Amend	The submitter considers APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 2. Offers of Acoustic Treatment - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 60 Ldn (5-day)and 65 Ldn (5-day) should be amended if 1. Offers of Acoustic Treatment > 65 dB Ldn (5-day) - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being >65 Ldn (5-day) is deleted as sought by the submitter in the first instance.	Amend 2. Offers of Acoustic Treatment - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 60 Ldn (5-day) and 65 Ldn (5-day) as follows:Offers of Acoustic Treatment - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being <del>between</del> > 60 Ldn (5-day) <del>and 65 Ldn (5-day)</del>	Open Submission
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Offers of Acoustic Treatment - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 60 L dn (5-day) and 65 L dn (5-day)	Grant Russell	202.96	Amend	Amend APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 2. Offers of Acoustic Treatment - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 60 Ldn (5-day) and 65 Ldn (5-day) as Operative Napier District Plan (NDP) Rules 6.27.2, 7.26.2 and 8.22.2 required that any new noise-sensitive activity (e.g. dwellings), or alteration or addition to an existing building used for a noise sensitive activity, within the Outer NCB, must be adequately insulated from Port noise. These rules came into place via Plan Change 410, Port Noise Provisions, Notified 16 April 2003 (Operative 1 June 2009). Dwellings or alterations subject to a consent after this date are not eligible for port funded mitigation. Including this date would clearly define eligibility. There is also a typo - "acheive" that requires correction.	Amend APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 2. Offers of Acoustic Treatment - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 60 Ldn (5-day)and 65 Ldn (5-day) as follows: a. Make an offer in writing to the owner(s) of any noise-sensitive activity <u>consented prior to 16 April 2003</u> which are shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being <del>between</del> > 60 dB Ldn (5-day) <del>and 65 Ldn (5-day)</del> to install acoustic treatment to <u>achieve</u> a spatial average indoor design sound level in the existing habitable spaces of the building(s) of 40 dB Ldn (5-day) where practicable. The indoor design sound level must be achieved with all windows and doors open unless adequate means of mechanical ventilation and cooling is provided, used, and maintained in operating order.	Open Submission
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Offers of Acoustic Treatment - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 60 L dn (5-day) and 65 L dn (5-day)	Grant Russell	202.97	Amend	Considers amendment of APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 2. Offers of Acoustic Treatment - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 60 Ldn (5-day)and 65 Ldn (5-day) is necessary as the intention is that the offer remains an open offer should the owners change their mind and choose to accept the offer, or new owners choose to take it up. Funding the mitigation would still be subject to budget / approval. Rework for clarity.	Amend APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 2. Offers of Acoustic Treatment - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 60 Ldn (5-day)and 65 Ldn (5-day) as follows: b. The offer must be made to owners of all noise-sensitive activities eligible in (a) above. To avoid doubt, new offers must be made to owners of noise-sensitive activities who have previously refused the offer or if the owner(s) have changed. <del>if the owner(s) have changed for the noise sensitive activity</del>	Open Submission

# APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Offers of Acoustic Treatment - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 60 L dn (5-day) and 65 L dn (5-day)	Grant Russell	202.98	Amend	Considers amendment of APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 2. Offers of Acoustic Treatment - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 60 Ldn (5-day) and 65 Ldn (5-day) is necessary to clarify that the total overall spend for APP5 (b) 2 and APP5 (b) 3 combined is not to exceed \$50,000 including GST.	Amend APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 2. Offers of Acoustic Treatment - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 60 Ldn (5-day) and 65 Ldn (5-day) as follows: c. The Port Operator shall contribute 100% of the cost of necessary acoustic treatment to doors and windows (stage 1), installation of mechanical ventilation and cooling (stage 2), and reinstatement of painting and decorating disturbed by improvements (stage 1 and 2). <del>provided that the total Port Operator contribution shall not exceed \$50,000 including GST (adjusted annually thereafter (indexed from 1 July 2024) using the Consumers Price Index to compensate for inflation.</del>	Open Submission
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Offers of Acoustic Treatment - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 60 L dn (5-day) and 65 L dn (5-day)	Grant Russell	202.99	Amend	Considers amendment of APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 2. Offers of Acoustic Treatment - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 60 Ldn (5-day) and 65 Ldn (5-day) is necessary to clarify that the total overall spend for APP5 (b) 2 and APP5 (b) 3 combined is not to exceed \$50,000 including GST.	Amend APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 2. Offers of Acoustic Treatment - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 60 Ldn (5-day) and 65 Ldn (5-day) as follows: d. The Port Operator / noise-sensitive activity shall both contribute 50% each of the cost of further facade improvements required to achieve the indoor design sound level. <del>(stage 3) provided that the total Port Operator contribution shall not exceed \$50,000 including GST (adjusted annually thereafter (indexed from 1 July 2024) using the Consumers Price Index to compensate for inflation.</del>	Open Submission
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Offers of Acoustic Treatment - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 60 L dn (5-day) and 65 L dn (5-day)	Grant Russell	202.100	Amend	Considers amendment of APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 2. Offers of Acoustic Treatment - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 60 Ldn (5-day) and 65 Ldn (5-day) is necessary to clarify that the total overall spend for APP5 (b) 2 and APP5 (b) 3 combined is not to exceed \$50,000 including GST. e. The total Port Operator contribution in APP5 (b) 2 and APP5 (b) 3 shall not exceed \$50,000 including GST (adjusted annually thereafter (indexed from 1 July 2024) using the Consumers Price Index to compensate for inflation.	Amend APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 2. Offers of Acoustic Treatment - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 60 Ldn (5-day) and 65 Ldn (5-day) to clarify that the total overall spend for APP5 (b) 2 and APP5 (b) 3 combined is not to exceed \$50,000 including GST.  <u>e. The total Port Operator contribution in APP5 (b) 2 and APP5 (b) 3 shall not exceed \$50,000 including GST (adjusted annually thereafter (indexed from 1 July 2024) using the Consumers Price Index to compensate for inflation.</u>	Open Submission
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Offers of Acoustic Treatment 55 - 60 dB L dn (5-day) - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 55 L dn (5-day) and 60 L dn (5-day) /	Grant Russell	202.101	Amend	Considers amendment of APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 3. Offers of Acoustic Treatment 55 - 60 dB Ldn (5-day) - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 55 Ldn (5-day) and 60 Ldn (5-day) is necessary for eligibility purposes.	Amend APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 3. Offers of Acoustic Treatment 55 - 60 dB Ldn (5-day) - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 55 Ldn (5-day) and 60 Ldn (5-day) as follows: a. The Port Noise Liaison Committee shall consider acoustic treatment for any noise-sensitive activities <del>consented prior to 16 April 2003</del> shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 55 dB Ldn (5-day) and 60 dB Ldn (5-day).	Open Submission
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Offers of Acoustic Treatment 55 - 60 dB L dn (5-day) - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 55 L dn (5-day) and 60 L dn (5-day) /	Grant Russell	202.102	Amend	Considers amendment of APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 3. Offers of Acoustic Treatment 55 - 60 dB Ldn (5-day) - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 55 Ldn (5-day) and 60 Ldn (5-day) is necessary for simplification to allow for not requiring acoustic report from MDA for houses in this zone. An acoustic report can be commissioned if above 60 dB Ldn (5 day) and trigger more intensive mitigation measures in part 2.	Amend APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 3. Offers of Acoustic Treatment 55 - 60 dB Ldn (5-day) - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 55 Ldn (5-day) and 60 Ldn (5-day) as follows: b. On request by the property owner of the noise-sensitive activity, the Port Operator shall consider contributing up to 50% of <del>acoustic treatment/sealing to doors and windows (stage 1), and/or installation of</del> mechanical ventilation and/or cooling (stage 2) provided that the total Port Operator contribution shall not exceed \$30,000 including GST (adjusted annually thereafter (indexed from 1 July 2024) using the Consumers Price Index to compensate for inflation). (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission

# APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Obligations of the Port Operator / Budget	Grant Russell	202.103	Amend	Considers amendment of APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 4. Obligations of the Port Operator Budget is necessary for process purposes for the composition of budgets detailed within the NMP.	Amend APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 4. Obligations of the Port Operator - Budget as follows: a. The Port Operator shall allocate an annual budget <del>for each financial year (1 October) at the beginning of each financial year (1 October)</del> for the implementation of Port Noise Mitigation Requirements. in the subsequent financial year.(Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Obligations of the Port Operator / Budget	Grant Russell	202.104	Amend	Considers amendment of APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 4. Obligations of the Port Operator Budget is necessary as final budget confirmation is from 1 October, therefore presentation must be after 1 October.	Amend APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 4. Obligations of the Port Operator Budget as follows: b. The Port Operator shall present the annual budget to the Port Noise Liaison Committee <del>at prior</del> to the beginning of each financial year (1 October) for endorsement.(Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Obligations of the Port Operator / Budget	Grant Russell	202.105	Oppose	Opposes APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 4. Obligations of the Port Operator Budget Clause c. as budgets require prior previous planning, and changes to the allocated budgets are not possible despite the resolution process and this is better placed in the NMP.	Delete APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 4. Obligations of the Port Operator Budget Clause c. in its entirety.(Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Obligations of the Port Operator / Acoustic Treatment	Grant Russell	202.106	Amend	Considers amendment of APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 4. Obligations of the Port Operator Acoustic Treatment is necessary for consistency.	Amend APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 4. Obligations of the Port Operator Acoustic Treatment as follows: a. Seek advice of <del>a suitably appropriate</del> qualified acoustic consultant when considering the acoustic treatment required in accordance with Appendix 5(b)1.a., Appendix 5(b)2.a. to achieve a spatial average indoor design sound level in the existing habitable spaces of the building(s) of 40 dB Ldn (5-day).	Open Submission
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Obligations of the Port Operator / Acoustic Treatment	Grant Russell	202.107	Amend	Considers amendment of APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 4. Obligations of the Port Operator Acoustic Treatment is necessary as it is not always achievable to complete all work required within one year (acoustic reports, quotes and contractor availability). There is a risk of subjectivity with "character of building".	Amend APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 4. Obligations of the Port Operator Acoustic Treatment as follows: b. <del>Where practicable, E</del> nsure all treatment work for a noise sensitive activity is carried out within one year of the date of acceptance of the offer in a cost effective manner and to the appropriate standard, while at the same time ensuring that the treatment work does not significantly compromise the character of the building.	Open Submission
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Obligations of the Port Operator / Acoustic Treatment	Grant Russell	202.108	Amend	Considers amendment of APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 4. Obligations of the Port Operator Acoustic Treatment is necessary as acoustic certificates were intended to only be available when the home owner has taken up stage 3 treatment. To date, no homeowners have taken up stage 3. Rewording transparently captures work in progress and prevents double ups in stage 1 & 2 mitigation measures on the same home. Also remove NCC reference and change to Port Noise Liaison Committee. Council has access as they are part of the Port Noise Liaison Committee, and homeowners may not want it on their Land Information Memorandum (LIM).	Amend APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 4. Obligations of the Port Operator Acoustic Treatment as follows:  d. <del>Where the Port Operator installs any acoustic treatment it shall forward a copy of an acoustic certificate to the Napier City Council, for works completed in accordance with Appendix 5(b)1.a. and Appendix 5(b)2.a.</del>  <u>The Port Operator must maintain a register of the noise-sensitive activities that are eligible for the port funded noise mitigation in this Appendix. The register must detail all noise mitigation offers from the Port Operator, completed noise mitigation works relating to an offer; and the total Port Operator contribution to date. The register shall be available to the Port Noise Liaison Committee. A property owners' access to the register will be limited to their property information only.</u>	Open Submission
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Obligations of the Property Owner	Grant Russell	202.109	Oppose	Opposes numbering duplication of 4. for APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements - Obligations of the Property Owner despite the number 4. having been used previously for Obligations of the Port Operator Acoustic Treatment. There is a numbering double-up.	Seeks an amendment to APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements Obligations of the Property Owner numbering as follows: <del>4.</del> <u>5.</u> Obligations of the Property Owner (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission

# APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Obligations of the Property Owner /	Grant Russell	202.110	Amend	Considers amendment of APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 4. Obligations of the Property Owner is necessary as NOISE-S3 refers to noise limits not mitigation eligibility.	Amend APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 4. Obligations of the Property Owner as follows: c. <del>If the noise sensitive activity is eligible for acoustic treatment in accordance with NOISE-S3 which are shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being 60-65 Ldn (5 day) shall</del> e. Contribute 50% of the cost of the Stage 3 acoustic treatment only <u>in accordance with Appendix 5 (b) 2.</u>	Open Submission
APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Obligations of the Property Owner /	Grant Russell	202.111	Amend	Considers amendment of APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 4. Obligations of the Property Owner is necessary as NOISE-S3 refers to noise limits not mitigation eligibility.	Amend APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements 4. Obligations of the Property Owner as follows: <del>d. For acoustic treatment to noise sensitive activity in accordance with NOISE-S3 which are shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being 55-60 Ldn (5 day) e-Contribute 50% of the cost of the stages 1 and 2 acoustic treatment in accordance with</del> <u>Appendix 5 (b) 3.</u>	Open Submission

# APP7 (a) - Mission Special Character Zone Structure Plan - Overall Map

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
APP7 (a) - Mission Special Character Zone Structure Plan - Overall Map /APP7 (a) - Mission Special Character Zone Structure Plan - Overall Map	Peter Holley	235.8	Amend	<p>Amend Mission Structure Plan map to show the three new development areas identified through the Mission Masterplan as explained in the Section 32 Report attached to this submission. Full details as to the reasons for requesting these changes are outlined in the s.32 report, however a summary of these are outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the proposed changes progress the best value of land-use mix and presents an opportunity to provide for residential development at a greater density than enabled by the underlying Rural Lifestyle Zone;</li> <li>- the land has limited productive value;</li> <li>- The land is generally higher in elevation and is therefore less susceptible to natural hazards than much of urban Napier;</li> <li>- the land is located immediately opposite existing residential land and the currently developing Mission Residential Precinct behind it;</li> <li>- the proposal is generally consistent with relevant PDP policy direction (particularly DEV3);</li> </ul> <p>technical supporting information demonstrates feasibility;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- four reasonably practicable options have been considered, and it has been found that the proposed approach is the most effective and efficient;</li> <li>- there are a number of environmental, economic, social and cultural benefits, as well as costs (as detailed in the s.32 report).</li> </ul>	Amend APP7(a) by showing the Mission Church Road Residential Precinct, the Artisan Village, and Future Development Area as set out in the full submission.	Open Submission
APP7 (a) - Mission Special Character Zone Structure Plan - Overall Map /APP7 (a) - Mission Special Character Zone Structure Plan - Overall Map /General	Peter Holley	235.10	Amend	<p>Add a new Appendix APP7(g) Road Overview for the new development areas for the reasons explained in the Section 32 report (see full submission). Refer to submission point 235.2 for a summary of the reasons for requesting the change.</p>	Add a new APP7(g) Road Overview (see full submission)..	Open Submission

# APP7 (b) - Mission Special Character Zone Structure Plan - Area Plan Map

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
APP7 (b) - Mission Special Character Zone Structure Plan - Area Plan Map /APP7 (b) - Mission Special Character Zone Structure Plan - Area Plan Map	Peter Holley	235.9	Amend	<p>Amend Mission Structure Plan map to show the three new development areas identified through the Mission Masterplan as explained in the Section 32 Report attached to this submission. See full submission for more detail. Full details as to the reasons for requesting these changes are outlined in the s.32 report, however a summary of these are outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the proposed changes progress the best value of land-use mix and presents an opportunity to provide for residential development at a greater density than enabled by the underlying Rural Lifestyle Zone;</li> <li>- the land has limited productive value;</li> <li>- The land is generally higher in elevation and is therefore less susceptible to natural hazards than much of urban Napier;</li> <li>- the land is located immediately opposite existing residential land and the currently developing Mission Residential Precinct behind it;</li> <li>- the proposal is generally consistent with relevant PDP policy direction (particularly DEV3);</li> <li>- technical supporting information demonstrates feasibility;</li> <li>- four reasonably practicable options have been considered, and it has been found that the proposed approach is the most effective and efficient;</li> <li>- there are a number of environmental, economic, social and cultural benefits, as well as costs (as detailed in the s.32 report).</li> </ul>	Amend APP7(b) by showing the Mission Church Road Residential Precinct, the Artisan Village, and Future Development Area as set out in the full submission.	Open Submission



# APP15 - Financial Contributions Tables

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
APP15 - Financial Contributions Tables /Table 1: Residential and Rural Financial Contributions /	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.9	Amend	Amend the footnote 1 for Jervoistown: Full Urban to reflect the addition of the Jervoistown Development Area.	Amend the footnote 1 for Jervoistown: Full Urban as follows: This option will only proceed if 75% of landowners in Jervoistown want and agree to pay for full infrastructural services in <u>accordance with the provisions of the Jervoistown Development Area.</u>	Open Submission
APP15 - Financial Contributions Tables //	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.86	Amend	The figures in the financial contributions tables are as at 1 July 2010 – 30 June 2011 (based on December 2009 indices). Consider updating to the correct figures as at the time the plan is being made operative, for ease of implementation. Indexing can then occur from that date.	Update figures to current financial year (indexed).	Open Submission
APP15 - Financial Contributions Tables /Table 2: Commercial and Industrial Financial Contributions /	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.87	Amend	The entry for Wharerangi has a number of errors that need correcting for implementation.	Amend “Wharerangi” to “Wharerangi Road Development Area”  Amend %557 to \$557  Footnote (1) should be amended as follows (or similar relief):  1. <u>Local Infrastructure required to facilitate development of land within the Wharerangi Road Development Area (refer Appendix 10) shown in Appendix 16 (Structure Plan).</u>  Amend the footnote so numeral “2” follows the list for “A stopbank along the Taipo Stream or ground raising with imported fill”	Open Submission
APP15 - Financial Contributions Tables /Table 2: Commercial and Industrial Financial Contributions /	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.88	Amend	There are several references in footnotes to “Infrastructure shown in Appendix 16 (Structure Plan)”. However, there is no infrastructure shown in the figure on this appendix. The intention is that financial contributions apply in addition to the provision of local infrastructure required to facilitate development. This was previously identified on structure plans in the operative district plan however the most appropriate infrastructure solution can be determined at the time of resource consent for subdivision and/or land development.	Amend references to “Infrastructure shown in Appendix 16 (Structure Plan)” to “Local infrastructure required to facilitate development of the area extend identified in Appendix 16 (Structure Plan)” (or similar relief).	Open Submission
APP15 - Financial Contributions Tables //	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.89	Amend	A full review is required of the formatting to ensure the values are correctly attributed to each area in accordance with the financial contributions policy.	Review and correct errors as required.	Open Submission
APP15 - Financial Contributions Tables //	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.90	Amend	Tables 3 and 4 provide a breakdown of the allocation of “non-local off-site” financial contributions. This is a breakdown of the figures provided in Tables 1 and 2 and is not required for implementation.	Consider deleting Tables 3 and 4 from the District Plan. Alternatively, update figures to show current allocation.	Open Submission
APP15 - Financial Contributions Tables /APP15 - Financial Contributions Tables /General	Phil Stickney	263.76	Oppose	Amend App-15 to correct inaccuracies. Appendix 31A of The Operative Plan denotes the breakdown of “Non-Local Offsite” Financial Contributions (noting poor formatting in The Plan) and which has the Te Awa Structure Plan area being liable for a Local Off-site contribution of \$392,630 per ha, and a charge of \$ 2,548 per metre of road frontage. Conversely, Table 3 in APP-15 denotes Park Island (which the proposed Wharerangi Development Area was a part of in the Operative Plan) as being liable for a charge of \$392,630 per hectare and Te Awa only being denoted as paying a charge of \$2,548 per metre (road frontage).  It is presumed that this is simply a typographic/editing error noting that the current Operative Plan provisions continue to prevail and advice from NCC officers is that this is indeed the case. The Submitter seeks clarity over this matter and any consequential changes required.	Amend APP-15 to reflect the Operative District Plan appendices and the status quo until such time as the Development Contributions Policy is reviewed.The Financial Contributions Policy review has not been completed and therefore the chapter should be an exact replica of that in the Operative District Plan.	Open Submission

# APP16 - Financial Contributions Areas

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
APP16 - Financial Contributions Areas /APP16 - Financial Contributions Areas /General	Phil Stickney	263.77	Oppose	<p>The Financial Contributions provisions should be an exact replica of the Operative District Plan because the review of the Financial Contributions Policy has not yet been completed. Appendix 31A of The Operative Plan denotes the breakdown of "Non-Local Offsite" Financial Contributions (noting poor formatting in The Plan) and which has the Te Awa Structure Plan area being liable for a Local Off-site contribution of \$392,630 per ha, and a charge of \$ 2,548 per metre of road frontage.</p> <p>Conversely, Table 3 in APP-15 denotes Park Island (which the proposed Wharerangi Development Area was a part of in the Operative Plan) as being liable for a charge of \$392,630 per hectare and Te Awa only being denoted as paying a charge of \$2,548 per metre (road frontage).It is presumed that this is simply a typographic/editing error noting that the current Operative Plan provisions continue to prevail and advice from NCC officers is that this is indeed the case. The Submitter seeks clarity over this matter and any consequential changes required.</p>	Amend APP-15 to reflect the Operative District Plan appendices and the status quo until such time as the Development Contributions Policy is reviewed.	Open Submission

# APP 18 - Rooding Hierarchy

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
APP18 - Rooding Hierarchy /APP18 - Rooding Hierarchy /General	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.165	Oppose	Request clarity around where the rooding hierarchy has come from and whether it aligns with the NZTA One Network Framework.	No specific relief sought	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
General	William Alivale	52.1	Oppose	The submitter considers that the Ahuriri Estuary should be protected / enhanced for its natural environment and recreational values and a theme park should be developed alongside the National Aquarium of New Zealand together with other initiatives to encourage the economic and recreational revitalisation of Marine Parade.	Seeks that the PDP OSZ - Open Space Zone Chapter Introduction purpose references initiatives to facilitate the economic and recreational revitalisation of the National Aquarium of New Zealand and Marine Parade.  That the NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone Chapter Introduction purpose and the NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes Chapter Issues, Objectives, Policies and Rules reference plans for the protection / enhancement of Ahuriri Estuary and Pandora Pond.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
General	Sam Hartree	72.1	Amend	The submitter considers that references to the Napier Vertical Datum 1962 (MSL = 0.00m) and Hawkes Bay Local Authority Datum 1972 (MSL = 10.00m) on resource and building consents should be replaced with the New Zealand Vertical Datum 2016 ("NZVD2016") given the Land Information New Zealand ("LINZ") Requirement that this is the only vertical datum for use in cadastral surveys from 1 July 2024.	Seeks amendment to the PDP and / or Introduction and General Provisions / How the plan works / General Approach for mention of the NZVD2016 in order to minimise confusion and ensure consistency with the LINZ Requirement and recent LiDAR coverage across the Hawke's Bay region.  (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
General	Rebecca Eng	99.1	Amend	It is not clear how conflicts between overlays and district wide provisions are to be managed eg the National Grid and its relationship to the Network Utilities and overlay provisions	Amend the text as follows:  An overlay spatially identifies distinctive values, risks or other factors which require management in a different manner from the underlying zone provisions. Where there is a conflict between the zone and the overlay, the overlay provisions prevail. <u>Where there is conflict between the network utility chapter provisions and the overlay, the network utility chapter provisions prevail.</u>  And any consequential amendments.	Open Submission
General	Sheena Revington Peter Revington	114.3	Oppose	Notes that on the 13 December and the maps that give this information are down for maintenance.	Notes that this is not acceptable - all the information should be readily available, and alternative methods to easily view impacted areas should be easily accessible. No specific relief sought	Open Submission
General	Cameron Drury	128.1	Amend	A summary of the following submission points relating to the Mission Residential Precinct, Mission Rural Residential Precinct, and the Mission Landscape and Visitor Precinct.	A summary of the parts of the Proposed District Plan where relief is sought in the following submission points.	Open Submission
General	Pip Beachen	142.1	Amend	Submitter notes that the full submission relates to the PDP and specific provisions. Submitter provides an introduction and background to its role in Hawke's Bay Property Development to indicate that it is well informed on challenges and opportunities for delivering housing within the provincial property market. Considers that the economic realities of delivering housing projects within Napier should be better understood by Council to ensure the provisions will reduce uncertainty and avoid additional time and costs to projects, in order to assist achieving the desired outcomes for the city. TW Property Generally supports the introduction of the Medium and High Density residential zone however considers that both these, and the General Residential Zone, include onerous standards and assessment criteria which contribute to the inefficient development of a site and/or add time and cost to a project during reporting and processing of consents. Refer to original submission for full details.	Submitter notes that the relief sought across the PDP reflect themes of supporting increased opportunities for Medium and High Density Housing, reducing uncertainty, ensuring workable standards.  No specific relief sought. Refer to original submission for full details.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
General	Pip Beachen	142.3	Amend	<p>Considers that increasing the certainty of gaining planning approvals is key to enable developers to actually deliver housing developments (including medium and high density housing). Considers that reducing risk (including time and cost risk) to projects will encourage developers to move from traditional infill and/or greenfield subdivisions to deliver duplex and terraced housing typologies within Napier across all market/occupancy sectors. Sufficient certainty is required at the early due diligence stage to make property acquisition and investment decisions. The submitter accepts that medium and higher density residential development will likely require resource consent applications, particularly for larger scale development, as not all potential matters may be adequately addressed through permitted activity standards. Considers that the flexibility of a resource consent process can also enable developments to better respond to site specific characteristics rather than compliance with a plethora of onerous standards. Considers that the resource consent process should provide as much certainty and clarity for all involved, including developers and also existing neighbouring property owners and communities. The submitter notes the current uncertainty in the design and resource consent process for housing projects in Napier is the implication of minimum floor levels in relation to flooding, whether or not a flood hazard is actually shown over the subject site. Considers that a flood level prescribed by Council is often applied as a consent condition following the assessment of an application with the resulting heights having potential to implicate compliance with height in relation to boundary standards and affect other factors in relation to building and landscape design.</p>	<p>Retain the MRZ and HRZ Zones.                      Retain the Restricted Discretionary Activity status for residential activities where activity conditions are met.                      Delete assessment criteria relating to Hastings Residential Intensification Guide.                      Clearly define the flood level and the areas which this applies to on the planning maps.</p>	Open Submission
General	Catherine Hawkins	148.5	Amend	<p>Hard copy of Proposed District Plan should be provided, with pages numbered. Hard copy submissions should be accepted.</p>	<p>Hard copy of Proposed District Plan should be provided, with pages numbered.                       Hard copy submissions should be accepted.</p>	Open Submission
General	James Witham	165.1	Amend	<p>Submitter summarises key themes from submission. Generally supports intentions of the PDP to achieve a more sustainable future for Napier. Notes that the PDP give effect to any and all parts of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL) specifically in the provisions related to the below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Versatile land</li> <li>- Sensitivity and reverse sensitivity effects</li> <li>- Strategic direction</li> <li>- Renewable energy</li> <li>- Subdivision</li> <li>- Earthworks</li> <li>- Noise</li> <li>- Zone provisions (Rural Lifestyle Zone and the Primary Production Zone)</li> </ul>	<p>General relief sought related to the implementation of the NPSHPL. See original submission for further detail</p>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
General	Sheena McGuire	168.1	Amend	Submitter provides background and summary of its organisational responsibilities including the construction, maintenance, and operation of the national railway network. This includes managing railway infrastructure and land, as well as rail freight and passenger services within New Zealand. The submitter is also the Requiring Authority for land designated for 'Railway Purposes' (or similar) in District Plans throughout New Zealand. Notes that the national railway network comprises 3,700km of track, over 200 locomotives, 18,100 hectares of land, and 1,350 buildings. The rail network is critical for safe and efficient freight and passenger movement in New Zealand. Rail contributes \$1.7 - 2.1 billion to the economy and helps reduce carbon emissions. As a result, rail is experiencing a renaissance as evidenced by the significant investment being made by the Government to reinvigorate the railway network, demonstrating a strong and continued confidence in rail's current and future potential. The government has allocated \$369.2 million in the recent budget to restore and enhance the national rail service. Key rail assets in Napier City include the Palmerston North to Gisborne Line, Napier Port Branch, and Pandora North Connection. The submitter aims to protect its ability to operate, maintain, and upgrade these assets. Notes that land uses near railway corridors should not compromise rail operations, and appropriate controls should be imposed for sensitive activities. Considers that safety, including sightlines and level crossings is a key concern. Notes that the submission to the Proposed Napier City District Plan is structured according to the plan's layout. Changes requested by the submitter are marked for insertion, deletion, or modification, with consequential changes noted for clarity. Refer to original submission for full details	No specific relief sought. Refer to original submission for all submission points.	Open Submission
General	Cameron Drury	170.1	Amend	Considers a General Statement should be added noting the need to enable opportunities for promoters to bring events to the region and for the community to hold events for its social, cultural and recreational wellbeing.	No specific relief sought. General statement to seek amendments to address the Facilitation of Temporary and Community Events.	Open Submission
General	Jeremy Harding	177.1	Oppose	The PDP does not cater for quarrying activities. Aggregate is an essential resource for the construction of housing, roading projects and other transport infrastructure, and is an important resource for increasing resilience. Aggregate deposits are location-specific and need to be protected from alternative land uses, and quarrying activities provided for. Transporting aggregate from outside of the region is very expensive. Consents to quarry will likely become expensive and hard to attain, and Napier will be disadvantaged without ready access to aggregate materials.	Seeks better acknowledgement and provision for quarrying activities.	Open Submission
General	Cameron Drury	179.1	Amend	Summary of matters addressed in other submission points	Seeks a number of amendments throughout the Plan focusing on rules, standards and assessment criteria.	Open Submission
General	Mark Leggett	180.1	Amend	Submitter provides general overview of the organisation's roles and responsibilities including the operation of a Service Centre at the Port of Napier. Notes that under the PDP, the Napier Service Centre would be in the Special Purpose Zone (PORTZ), subject to various overlays and provisions. Supports Council's plan but is concerned about potential restrictions on its operations highlighting the scope of definitions, stormwater management, transport provisions, coastal environment objectives, light spill, signs, height controls, and site coverage in the Port area. Refer to original submission for full details.	Summary of relief sought provided. Seeks amendments to clarify definitions, exempt Port sites from certain provisions, and improve the work-ability of the PDP. Refer to original submission and proceeding submission points for full details.	Open Submission
General	Cameron Drury	185.1	Amend	Considers the properties at 41 and 63 Corunna Bay to be appropriate for both Light Industrial activities (for which it is currently zoned) and Large Format Retail activities. This would provide more opportunity to develop Large Format Retail activities within close proximity to the City Centre and existing Large Format Retail zone, without generating reverse sensitivity effect on light industrial activities that are able to co-located in the area. Provision for both Light Industry and Large Format Retail activities could be enabled through an area specific precinct that incorporates the subject sites.	Add new "Corunna Bay" precinct to the planning maps, with associated provisions to enable LFR and Light Industry activities, or alternative relief as sought elsewhere in this submission.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
General	Angela McFlynn	189.25	Amend	The submitter considers that the purpose of controlled and restricted discretionary activities is to limit the matters that are required to be considered to those matters specifically stated in the Plan as being relevant to the specific activity or rule that is unable to be complied with. Including as a matter over which control or discretion is restricted to essentially the entire plan is not appropriate. If a proposal meets the criteria for consideration as either a controlled or restricted discretionary activity, and the plan has been competently prepared to give effect to those objectives and policies, further specific consideration of objectives and policies should not be necessary in association with applications for resource consent for controlled or restricted discretionary activities.	Seeks that for all sections of the Plan, assessment criteria for controlled and restricted discretionary activities are amended to remove any requirement to specifically consider the objectives and policies of the plan.	Open Submission
General	Angela McFlynn	189.47	Oppose	Considers the residential sections of the Proposed District Plan include several references to the Hastings Residential Intensification Design Guide. This guide has been used as the basis for Hastings District Council to justify granting numerous poor quality residential developments that are significantly degrading the quality of the existing residential environment. The design guide is not fit for purpose and should not be adopted by Napier City Council, where the quality of recent developments has been of a far higher standard. This quality of developments being undertaken within Napier should be protected and strived for, and if necessary, an appropriate, fit for purpose design guide developed to ensure that the character and amenity of Napier is not degraded in a similar manner to recent developments in Hastings.	Delete all references to the Hastings Residential Intensification Design Guide from the Proposed Napier District Plan as notified.	Open Submission
General	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.1	Amend	For ease and clarity in plan implementation, a consistent approach to infringements to standards is sought. Infringements to standards should be a separate activity in the activity table, with a default restricted discretionary activity status, with an alternative activity status listed as required. Standards should not be listed as an activity condition for each individual activity. Each activity can also exclude requiring to comply with certain standards if relevant.	Review all rule tables and update for consistency.	Open Submission
General	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.8	Amend	The PDP only enables development of Jervoistown in accordance with the "unserved" provisions of the operative district plan (ODP) i.e. minimum 2,500sqm sites due to the requirement to provide for onsite wastewater discharge, and the potential cumulative stormwater management challenges for higher intensity development. However, the ODP also includes a structure plan allowing for full urbanization in the event a clear majority (75%) of land owners want this option, and agree to pay for the full urban services to be put in place. Adding a new "Jervoistown Development Area" consistent with Appendix 28C of the ODP, which could be triggered via Council resolution where 75% of landowners agree to pursue urbanization of Jervoistown, will retain this option for landowners into the future.	Add new "Jervoistown Development Area" with provisions consistent with Appendix 28C of the ODP (see full submission).	Open Submission
General	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.51	Amend	The existing rules for minor residential units throughout the residential and rural zones in the PDP allow a maximum 80sqm. This excludes garages. This provides for a large 2 bedroom or small three bedroom residential unit and could result in essentially a full sized second unit. Second units may not effectively and efficiently achieve the objectives and policies for each of these zones. Enabling a smaller unit of maximum 65sqm may provide for extended family and communal living opportunities without detracting from the rural character/highly productive land in rural zones, and the quality living environment objectives in the residential zones.	Consider reducing the permitted GFA limit for minor residential units in all zones from 80sqm to 65sqm.	Open Submission
General	Ellen Robotham	198.1	Amend	Submitter provides direction to the full submission for contextual information	No relief sought.	Open Submission
General	Georgina McPherson	215.1	Amend	The Fuel Company submissions are as set out in the attached document.	Make the changes sought in the Fuel Company submission or alternative changes to give effect to the relief sought.	Open Submission
General	Shravan Miryala	217.1	Amend	Submitter provides background and context to organisation's roles and responsibilities. Notes that the rationale for Z Energy's submission on each of these matters, and the relief sought is contained in Schedule A of the attached document.	No specific relief sought. Inferred relief to amend as requested in attachment.	Open Submission
General	Maria Roberts	219.4	Amend	Amend the District Plan to include the word accessible, which is part of quality design and related to the Napier City Council Disability Strategy.	Amend wording overall to include the word accessible. Example Given: Quality Design Quality, high amenity, accessible and healthy environments to live, work and play.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
General	Maria Roberts	219.5	Amend	Amend the Design Guidelines to include "Universal Design". Understands that the new Council Building / Library is being built using universal design principles.	Seeks a reputable website for Universal Design.	Open Submission
General	Amelia Longley	222.12	Amend	All 'Open Space Zones' provisions. Chapter structures and rule frameworks are inconsistent across the Open Spaces Zones. Amend Open Space Zone chapter structure and rule frameworks to be consistent across the zones.	In addition to the specific submission points outlined further, we request that PDP provisions are amended to read consistently across the Open Space Zone and related chapters (including District Wide Activity chapters).	Open Submission
General	Amelia Longley	222.13	Amend	Link between Rules Table and Standards Table: It is important that the rules are clearly linked to relevant standards. The approach across the Open Space Zone is inconsistent and confusing.	Amend provisions to link rules and standards in a consistent manner across Open Space Zones. Either amend rules to reference relevant standards as a condition of the rules and/or include the following reference at the start of the rules table and the standards table ' All activities must comply with the permitted activity standards set out in the standards table below'	Open Submission
General	Bernadette & Christopher Bastion	229.1	Amend	Objects Medium Density Residential (MRZ) and High Density Residential (HRZ) in Napier south. Napier South is an area with character, that is well maintained that should be preserved. HRZ will have detrimental effects on shade, sunlight, noise, privacy, traffic and parking as the street is narrow.	Seeks the review of the location of high-density residential zones. The residents have not been well informed about the proposal.	Open Submission
General	Alicia McKinnon	230.13	Amend	Acknowledge that the discharge of contaminants (including dust) is the responsibility of the HB Regional Council. However, this is not effective in managing the dust that is created from 85 Battery Road at certain times	Better site management is required to mitigate the adverse effects of dust on the amenity of surrounding land uses.	Open Submission
General	Peter Holley	235.4	Amend	Add a new Chapter to the Proposed Napier District Plan titled: PREC3A - Mission Church Road Residential Precinct.  Full details as to the reasons for requesting these changes are outlined in the s.32 report (refer full submission), however a summary of these are outlined below:  the proposed changes progress the best value of land-use mix and presents an opportunity to provide for residential development at a greater density than enabled by the underlying Rural Lifestyle Zone; the land has limited productive value; The land is generally higher in elevation and is therefore less susceptible to natural hazards than much of urban Napier; the land is located immediately opposite existing residential land and the currently developing Mission Residential Precinct behind it; the proposal is generally consistent with relevant PDP policy direction (particularly DEV3); technical supporting information demonstrates feasibility; four reasonably practicable options have been considered, and it has been found that the proposed approach is the most effective and efficient; there are a number of environmental, economic, social and cultural benefits, as well as costs (as detailed in the s.32 report).	Add new chapter: PREC3A - Mission Church Road Residential Precinct. Refer to full submission for details.	Open Submission
General	Peter Holley	235.11	Amend	Add new APP7(h) - Stormwater Overview in support of the requested new development areas for the reasons set out in the Section 32 Report (see full submission). A summary of the reasons for requesting the change can be found in submission point 235.2.	Add new APP7(h) - Stormwater Overview as per the full submission.	Open Submission
General	Peter Holley	235.12	Amend	Add new APP7(i) Wastewater Overview in support of the requested new development areas for the reasons set out in the Section 32 Report (refer to full submission for more detail). A summary of the reasons for requesting the change can be found in submission point 235.2.	Add new APP7(i) as set out in the full submission.	Open Submission
General	Peter Holley	235.13	Amend	Add new APP7(j) Water Overview in support of the requested new development areas for the reasons set out in the Section 32 Report (refer full submission for more detail). A summary of the reasons for requesting the change can be found in submission point 235.2.	Add new APP7(j) as set out in the full submission.	Open Submission
General	Peter Holley	235.15	Amend	Seeks consequential amendments as required to enable the requested Mission Church Road Residential Precinct and Artisan Village Area to be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan in a manner that implements the Mission Masterplan and appropriately provides for the sustainable management purpose of the RMA. See full submission for attachments including s.32 report, and evidence of appropriate development such as the landscape study, traffic assessment and design, and civil engineering assessment.	Seeks consequential amendments as required to enable the requested Mission Church Road Residential Precinct and Artisan Village Area to be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan in a manner that implements the Mission Masterplan and appropriately provides for the sustainable management purpose of the RMA.	Open Submission



Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
General	Phil Stickney	247.1	Amend	The submitter seeks to develop land at 195 and 215 Riverbend Road, 20 Waterworth Avenue, and 75 and 91 Waverley Avenue, for the purposes of a comprehensively designed medium density residential development with a new local commercial centre, parks, stormwater attenuation and treatment areas and all supporting infrastructure, and requests changes throughout the PDP to facilitate this.	Amend the planning maps to introduce a new Development Area for the land (and appropriate underlying zoning) to facilitate a medium density residential development (Inferred).	Open Submission
General	Phil Stickney	247.41	Amend	Considers an amendment to include an additional Development Area to include the Riverbend Road Development Area, as per attachment 3 of the submission,	Amend the plan to include the Riverbend Road Development Area.	Open Submission
General	Kainga Ora - Brendon Liggett	285.1	Support	Submitter provides an overall introduction to its roles and responsibilities to give effect to Government policies. Submitter provides general information on its objectives, position and interest in the PDP. Generally support the PDP's alignment with the NPS-UD, medium to high-density housing, and papakāinga chapters. Seek amendments to ensure enabling standards and reflect zoning frameworks. Submitter recognizes the challenges Napier City faces with population growth and believes the PDP will help accommodate it. Generally support the PDP but seek amendments for more reflective development provisions. See original submission for full details.	No relief sought	Open Submission

# Planning Maps

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Planning Maps	Obiora Lawrence Omulu	49.1	Support	Supports MRZ provisions and considers that this will generate more economic activity and revenue for the City.	Retain MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) as notified to provide more housing.(Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Joanne Black	79.3	Amend	Opposes proposed high-density residential zoning in Napier South. Considers that the the character and history of Vigor Brown St should be preserved and protected by making the area of Vigor Brown Street between Carnell Street to Kennedy Road and Kennedy Road to Latham Street, along with Winifred Street, a general residential zone with the addition of a heritage overlay. Considers the significance of homes dating back over 100 years having survived 1931 earthquake. Considers that the building of up to a 19.5 metre apartment style dwelling next to a 100 year old Villa would completely spoil the history and character of the homes in the area. Refers to the report by architect Graham Linwood on Napier's heritage character areas which emphasizes the historic value and character of Napier South's built environment. Consider that there is concern for potential alteration of character due to attractiveness to developers for medium-density housing. Considers that councils proposed zoning disregards this report as there is no difference between the two streets with regards to the historic qualities and style and era of housing.	Amend proposed high density zone for Vigor Brown Street & Winfred Street in Napier South, to be zoned General residential with a historic overlay, like MacDonald Street between Carnell Street and Kennedy Road. Considers that there is no difference in the history or character of the homes in these streets and the council itself commissioned a report in 2019 by registered architect Graham Linwood (Heritage Review) which concluded this.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Tom Hosford	95.1	Amend	Considers that the area of foreshore comprising Spriggs Park, Ahuriri Beach and Perfume Point should be rezoned to Open Space Zone so that it is consistent with the description of that zone and enables cohesive management with the reserve land on either side.	Rezone the land currently zoned Natural Open Space Zone in the PDP in the area encompassing Spriggs Park, Ahuriri Park, and Perfume Point to Open Space Zone.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Rebecca Eng	99.84	Amend	The five features of the National Grid shown on the Planning Maps are not defined in the Definitions chapter. Instead the National Grid is defined and the term is used for provisions throughout the Plan. Transpower seeks that the National Grid are defined on the Planning Maps, and the reference to 'Napier' is removed as the assets are national assets. Transpower also seeks the deletion of the remaining four features (being - Napier Transmission Lines Buffer; Transmission Structures; Substations; and Substation Setbacks) as it does not consider these mapping features necessary. Specific to the 'Napier Transmission Lines Buffer', Transpower has concerns with the identification on the maps as the aerial mapping cannot always be relied upon. Instead Transpower's preference is for reliance on the setbacks stipulated in the definitions for National Grid Yard and National Grid Subdivision Corridor. The substation features are not considered necessary as the only references to 'substations' in the PDP are in relation to the National Grid assets.	Transpower seeks the map features be amended as follows:  Transpower supports the mapping of the National Grid. However, in context of the terminology of the PDP (which refers to 'National Grid' and not 'Transmission Lines') Transpower seeks the Grid be identified as 'National Grid' on the planning maps. The reference to 'Napier' is opposed as the assets are not specific to Napier, rather are national assets.- Replace the 'Napier Transmission Lines' mapping feature with 'National Grid Lines'. - Delete the Napier Transmission Lines Buffer mapping feature - Delete the Transmission Structures mapping feature - Delete the Substations mapping feature - Delete the Substation Setbacks mapping feature	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Pip Beachen	101.1	Oppose	Considers that RPZ (Rural Production Zone) zoning as notified at 66 Franklin Road, Bay View is inappropriate. Considers that Settlement Zone Provisions are better suited for a site of this area and is morereflective of the development characteristics in the surrounding area. Notes that the site's size,location, soil characteristics and that it is surrounded by residential activities, and it is consideredthat its productive capacity is significantly compromised and the issues outlined within theRural Production Zone are not relevant to the site. Refer to original submission for full details.	Seeks a SETZ (Settlement Zone) zoning at 66 Franklin Road, Bay View for residential development that is consistent with a cluster of residential, commercial, light industrial, and / or community activities located in rural areas or coastal environments. Refer to original submission for full details.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Paul O'Shaughnessy	102.1	Oppose	Rezone 4, 29 and 31 Faraday Street, and a portion of 115 Faraday Street and 121 Faraday Street to Mixed Use Zone.  Rezone 123, 129, 135, 137, 139, 143 and 147 Carlyle Street to Mixed Use Zone.	Rezone 4, 29 and 31 Faraday Street, and a portion of 115 Faraday Street and 121 Faraday Street to Mixed Use Zone.  Rezone 123, 129, 135, 137, 139, 143 and 147 Carlyle Street to Mixed Use Zone.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Juliette Ruth Cadwallader	108.1	Oppose	Opposed Proposed Napier District Plan.	No specific relief sought.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Peter Gillies	109.2	Amend	Remove the properties at 13, 15, 19 and 23 Shakespeare Road from the Napier City Heritage Precinct extent.	Remove the properties at 13, 15, 19 and 23 Shakespeare Road from the Napier City Heritage Precinct extent.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Planning Maps	Lawrence and Kerryn Yule	112.4	Amend	Opposes the zoning of Vigor Brown Street and the surrounding streets of George's Drive, Carnell, and MacDonald Street as High Density Residential Zone.	No specific relief sought. Amend the zoning of Vigor Brown Street and the surrounding streets of George's Drive, Carnell, and MacDonald Street to General Residential [inferred]	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Alison Francis	115.1	Amend	<p>Rezone the properties at 225 Waverley Road and 45 Ulyatt Road, Meeanee rezoned from the proposed Rural Production Zone to either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Large Lot Residential, or</li> <li>- Future Urban Zone</li> </ul> <p>Due to a previous inclusion in the HPU DS document and encroachment of nearby retirement village we believe that the proposed zoning is incorrect.</p>	<p>Rezone the properties at 225 Waverley Road and 45 Ulyatt Road, Meeanee to either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Large Lot Residential, or</li> <li>- Future Urban Zone.</li> </ul>	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Christine Briasco	117.1	Amend	<p>Considers that McDonald Street and Vigor Brown Street bounded by the eastern side of Carnell Street and Latham Street, and Nelson Crescent from Latham Street to Kennedy Road be included in the Napier South Historic Heritage Overlay.</p> <p>Considers that the areas additional to McDonald Street between Carnell Street and Kennedy Road are currently designated High or Medium Density Residential Zones in the Proposed District Plan should be rezoned General Residential.</p> <p>This would protect the heritage and character values identified in the Graham Linwood Napier Heritage Character Areas Study.</p>	<p>Extend the Napier South Historic Heritage Area to include McDonald Street and Vigor Brown Street bounded by the eastern side of Carnell Street and Latham Street, and Nelson Crescent from Latham Street to Kennedy Road.</p> <p>Rezone the remainder of Napier South suburban area to General Residential.</p>	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Christine Briasco	117.2	Oppose	<p>Considers that there is no requirement for Council to provide for 6 storey homes in Napier within the High Density Residential Zone for Tier 2 districts/cities under the NPS:UD.</p> <p>Considers that buildings developed to the extent permitted within the High Density Residential Zone could have the following adverse impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>visual dominance</li> <li>shading and privacy of neighbouring properties</li> <li>impacts on character</li> <li>effect heritage values within neighbouring heritage areas</li> <li>traffic congestion, safety and parking issues</li> <li>social cohesion/neighbourhood values</li> </ul>	<p>Rezone the entire area of Napier South General Residential.</p> <p>If High Density Residential Zones are to remain in the District Plan, then these should be restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area from the north side of Wellesley Road from Latham Street to Thackeray Street: and</li> <li>The area from the north side of Wellesley Road to the Marine Parade from Latham Street northwards</li> </ul>	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Christine Briasco	117.3	Amend	<p>Considers that buildings developed to the extent permitted within the Medium Density Residential Zone could have the following adverse impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>visual dominance</li> <li>shading and privacy of neighbouring properties</li> <li>impacts on character</li> <li>effect heritage values within neighbouring heritage areas</li> <li>traffic congestion, safety and parking issues</li> <li>social cohesion/neighbourhood values</li> <li>Overloading an already stretched 3 waters infrastructure system</li> <li>Flooding risks</li> </ul> <p>Napier South has already been developed to medium density, albeit low-rise.</p>	<p>Rezone the entire area of Napier South to General Residential Zone</p> <p>If Medium Density Residential Zones are to remain in the District Plan, then in Napier South these should be restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two storey maximum height: and</li> <li>The right to privacy and access to sunlight of dwellings neighbouring new developments is assured</li> </ul>	Open Submission

# Planning Maps

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Planning Maps	Brian Doherty	123.1	Amend	Amend Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) to exclude McDonald Street. MRZ does not support the historic heritage aesthetic of the street. Submitter has concerns due to spending time restoring their villa to enhance their community. Considers impacts on adequate sunlight, security and privacy, and parking due to issues already present with nearby events and schools.  Wants McDonald Street to be included in the historic heritage overlay.	Seeks to retain Low Density Housing in McDonald Street.  Amend the historic heritage overlay to include McDonald Street.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Tom Hosford	124.1	Amend	Considers that 100 Churchill Drive which is zoned as RLZ (Rural Lifestyle Zone), TEZ (Tertiary Education Zone) and Special Character Landscapes - Taradale Hills (SCL:01) Natural Environmental Values Overlay in the PDP is an inefficient use of the land given its 1.5 ha minimum average lot size Standard (SUB-S3: minimum allotment sizes - rural) and proximity to the urban environment. Rezoning as LLRZ (Large Lot Residential Zone) instead would avoid urban sprawl in accordance with HPUDS and NPS-UD.  Rezoning as LLRZ would also be consistent with the land to the east which is also zoned RLZ and has been subdivided into residential allotments ranging from 1,019m2 to 5,256m2 in site area. This consists of 10 properties from 24 - 42 Churchill Drive.  (The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)	Rezone 100, 24-48 Churchill Drive, Taradale from RLZ (Rural Lifestyle Zone) to LLRZ (Large Lot Residential Zone).	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Matthew Burnside	125.1	Amend	Supports the inclusion of 26 Georges Drive in the Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay extent as a contributory property.  Either rezone land to the rear of 26 Georges Drive that is not included in the Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay and has been rezoned to medium Density Residential (properties affected listed below) to General Residential Zone; or include these properties in the Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay as non-contributory properties. The properties affected include:  1, 1A-1C, 1/3A-3/3A Sanders Ave 12, 14, 14A, 16, 16A, 18, 20, and 24 Georges Drive 2, 2A, 4, 6, 8, 10 Herrick Street	Retain the inclusion of 26 George Drive in the Marewa Post-War Historic heritage Overlay as a contributory property.  Either rezone land to the rear of 26 Georges Drive that is not included in the Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay and has been rezoned to medium Density Residential (properties affected listed below) to General Residential Zone; or include these properties in the Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay as non-contributory properties.  The properties affected include:  1, 1A-1C, 1/3A-3/3A Sanders Ave 12, 14, 14A, 16, 16A, 18, 20, and 24 Georges Drive 2, 2A, 4, 6, 8, 10 Herrick Street	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Cameron Drury	128.10	Amend	Considers the extent of the General Residential Zone and Mission Residential Precinct needs to be amended to align with the boundary of Lot 1 DP 559656 (see full submission for attachment). This will avoid a strip of Rural Lifestyle zoned land between the two lots, enabling the efficient and effective application of planning provisions to each of the lots. The indicative public access route mapping layer also needs to be removed from affecting Lot 2 DP 559656 as this is inconsistent with the alignment of public paths in the Mission Special Character Zone Structure Plan.	That the extent of the General Residential Zone and Mission Residential Precinct within Lot 2 DP 559656 be extended to and aligned with the boundary of Lot 1 DP 559656 (see attached plan).  That the Indicative Public Access Route mapping layer be removed from affecting Lot 2 DP 559656.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Nick Wakefield	131.8	Amend	Considers that GRZ (General Residential Zone) zoning as notified for the southern section of Marine Parade / McGrath Street in addition to Wellesley Road / Hastings Street is inappropriate.	Seeks a MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) zoning for the southern section of Marine Parade / McGrath Street in addition to the lower part of Wellesley Road for residential development given the proximity to MRZ and the OSZ (Open Space Zone).(The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Nick Wakefield	131.9	Amend	Considers that RPROZ (Rural Production Zone) as notified at Meeanee Road / Gavin Black Street and Riverbend Road / The Loop / Willowbank Avenue is inappropriate.	Seeks a SETZ (Settlement Zone) zoning at Meeanee Road / Gavin Black Street and Riverbend Road / The Loop / Willowbank Avenue that is more appropriate given the adjacent SETZ and existing land uses.  (The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)	Open Submission

# Planning Maps

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Planning Maps	Nick Wakefield	131.10	Amend	Considers that RLZ (Rural Lifestyle Zone) zoning as notified for the parcels of land between Le Quesne Road / Franklin Road / Rogers Road / Main North Road / Ferguson Street South / Onehunga Road, Bay View is inappropriate in terms of character, size and amenity.	Seeks a SETZ (Settlement Zone) zoning for the parcels of land between Le Quesne Road / Franklin Road / Rogers Road / Main North Road / Ferguson Street South / Onehunga Road, Bay View that is consistent with its residential amenity, character and the activities located there.  (The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Kirsty Gillespie	135.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the zoning of 2A Bull Street, Ahuriri 4110 within a Significant Hazardous Facilities Risk Management Overlay.  (Refer to original submission for full reasons).	Seeks that either the Significant Hazardous Facilities Risk Management Overlay is removed from 2A Bull Street, Ahuriri 4110; and / or the onus is placed upon the oil company to mitigate risk; and / or the oil company purchases the properties affected by the Significant Hazardous Facilities Risk Management Overlay including the reimbursement for costs incurred to date to subdivide and redevelop the submitter's site.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Alison Francis	139.1	Amend	Considers that RPROZ (Rural Production Zone) as notified at Riverbend Road / The Loop is inappropriate, while Settlement Zone recognises clusters of residential communities located in rural areas, as these areas are generally not serviced by Council. Considers productive land use would result in reverse sensitivity issues and there is an inability to ever meet the minimum lot size of 4Ha. Re-zoning would better fit with the desired outcomes of the SETZ Objectives. Refer to original submission for full details	Seeks a SETZ (Settlement Zone) zoning at Riverbend Road / The Loop as more appropriate given the existing level of development and residential character of the area. Refer to original submission for full details	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Pip Beachen	142.2	Support	Supports the introduction of a Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone within Napier and the areas that this has been applied to throughout the City. Notes that Napier currently has a housing shortage and that Medium and high density housing can provide additional supply as well as greater choice in both housing typologies and price points to the market. Considers that Providing greater zoned opportunities for medium and high density housing allows the market to respond and deliver housing in appropriate locations and demand sectors. The more land available for medium and high residential housing, the more likely it is that this typology can be delivered at a scale that meets demands or need. Does not consider that the market is ready for six story developments such as what has been proposed via the High Density Residential Zone, However, submitter is not in opposition to it as it allows the market to grow into this in the future.	Retain MRZ and HRZ zones and their spatial extent on the planning maps.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Pip Beachen	142.13	Amend	Submitter notes a current area of uncertainty experienced in the design and resource consent process for housing projects in Napier is the implication of minimum floor levels in relation to flooding, whether or not a flood hazard is actually shown over the subject site. A flood level prescribed by Council is often applied as a consent condition following the assessment of an application with the resulting heights having potential to implicate compliance with height in relation to boundary standards and affect other factors in relation to building and landscape design. Seeks clarification of this flood level and requests that it is clearly set out in the relevant standards and linked to planning maps for spatial clarity of application, and/or through an amendment to the code of practice.	Map minimum floor level requirements on the planning maps, or alternative relief.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Sera Chambers	150.85	Oppose	considers that the current and proposed noise overlay for the Airport does not provide for the full extent of noise disturbance from this infrastructure outside of the Inner and Outer Airport Control Boundary Overlays. It also does not take into consideration health and safety and environmental impacts from increased flights over residential areas e.g. dust.	opposes on the basis that the plan should continue to allow the people of Napier the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated and compensated by the entity affecting e.g. noise from Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Planning Maps	Sera Chambers	150.86	Oppose	considers that the e-Plan current and proposed noise overlay for the Airport does not provide for the full extent of noise disturbance from this infrastructure outside of the Inner and Outer Airport Control Boundary Overlays. It also does not take into consideration health and safety and environmental impacts from increased flights over residential areas e.g. dust.	opposes on the basis that the plan should continue to allow the people of Napier the enjoyment of their property rights as a guiding principle by maintaining their rights to have their say on how a development may impact their property and any options to have the impact mitigated and compensated by the entity affecting e.g. noise from Hawke's Bay Airport Ltd.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Jane Fordyce	155.1	Amend	Amend Medium Density Residential Zones (MRZ) to exclude Upham Crescent. Considers Crescent as a special character residential street. Upham Crescent among the first streets developed in the area, sections are large, which places them at risk of developments. Those living on Upham crescent did not receive notice of potential zone change to MRZ. MRZ will increase congestion due to nearby facilities. The proposal is not fair to landowners due to loss of privacy, sunlight and neighbourhood character. There have been opportunities for new developments to be places in other areas for example, Parklands and Te Awa. There is unease around potential development of reserves. Seeks to have Upham Crescent removed from MRZ. Signatures from those on the street who are in support of the opposition to MRZ is attached in original submission.	Seeks to remove Upham Crescent from MRZ.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	James Witham	165.2	Amend	Considers that versatile land/soils as defined in the Hawkes Bay Regional Policy Statement and this plan appropriately identify Highly Productive Land and other land with Highly Productive Characteristics as referred to in c13.4(3) of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. Considers that the land makes significant contributions to the overall economic and social well-being of the wider Hawkes Bay. Considers the inclusion of the additional land is critical to protecting some of the most highly productive land and implementing policy and rule direction in this plan or to give effect to the relief sought in this submission.	Include a layer in the District Plan Maps which identifies Versatile Soils as referred to in the definition in this plan and the Hawkes Bay Regional Policy Statement or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Sheena McGuire	168.64	Oppose	Notes that there is an area of this overlay which extends over the designated Napier Port Branch rail corridor. Supports the intent of the overlay for the surrounding area, however, having reviewed SCHED4 attributes, values and character which define this overlay, does not consider it appropriate to include the operational rail corridor within this overlay.	Remove the Iron Pot Heritage Overlay from the designated rail corridor.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Sheena McGuire	168.103	Amend	Notes that noise from rail corridors can give rise to adverse health effects on sensitive land uses located within 100m of the transport boundary. Notes that the research and guidelines relating to these effects are widely accepted internationally and applied in New Zealand. Seeks that this overlay is extended to include land up to 100m from the rail boundaries.	Amend High Land Transport Noise Overlay extent to 100m from the designated boundaries of the rail and road network.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Sheena McGuire	168.104	Amend	Seeks the inclusion of a new Rail Vibration Alert Area Overlay to identify areas susceptible to rail vibration, within 60m of the rail corridor boundary. Seeks this new overlay be included on the planning maps.	Add Rail Vibration Alert Area Overlay to the planning maps within 60m of the designated rail corridor.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Sheena McGuire	168.113	Amend	Notes that the Napier Hill Mataruahou Amenity Precinct extends over the Napier Port Branch in two locations. Supports the intent of this overlay but does not consider it appropriate to include the established, operational rail corridor within a residential amenity precinct overlay.	Remove the Napier Hill Mataruahou Amenity Precinct Overlay from the designated rail corridor.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Sheena McGuire	168.120	Amend	Notes that there are two very small areas of this overlay which extend onto the designated rail corridor. Generally supports the intent of this overlay but does not consider it appropriate to include the established, operational rail corridor within a Mixed Use precinct overlay. Notes that the overlay looks to have included the corridor in error due the small inclusions and seeks that the overlay follows the site boundaries.	Remove the West Quay Waterfront Precinct overlay from the designated rail corridor.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Planning Maps	Angela McFlynn	169.1	Amend	Considers the zoning of the land at 35, 45, 49 & 55 The Loop, and 69 Waverley Road (refer to attached map) as Rural Production Zone is inappropriate. The use of this land for productive rural activities is not economically viable. The land is ideally located for Rural Lifestyle Zoning, providing a transition between the residential zone to the north, and the productive rural zoned land to the south.	Amend 35, 45, 49 & 55 The Loop, and 69 Waverley Road to be Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	171.34	Amend	The AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone is mapped to cover the full extent of the Lagoon Farm Site north of Prebensen Drive. The masterplan for the Ahuriri Regional Park has not yet been prepared. The submission of the Ahuriri Regional Park Joint Committee seeks to ensure the zone provisions align with the vision for the regional park. However, it may be that the full Site is not required to facilitate the development of the regional park and achieve the objectives. There may be opportunity for a part of the Site to be rezoned for alternative uses. The Council would like to keep the door open on the final zoning of any potential residual land post masterplan confirmation.	Consider rezoning part of the land identified as AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater for alternative uses following completion of the Ahuriri Regional Park Masterplan.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Matthew Morley	174.1	Oppose	Rezoning 18, 20, 22 Durham Avenue and 39 Southwark Avenue from MRZ (Medium-density Residential Zone) to Local Centre Zone (LCZ). The current uses include a mix of commercial and residential which is on 22 Durham Avenue and 39 Southwark Avenue. The submitter's intention is to expand the Medical Centre activity to the sites at 22 Durham Avenue and 39 Southwark Avenue in the future via Resource Consent approval. The current and future use of the subject sites are consistent with the purpose of the LCZ, and rezoning the sites would enable the sites to be redeveloped as planned more easily. The sites are on an urban connector road, close to the Tamatea residential area, and will enable local services to be provided to the local community.	Rezoning 18, 20, 22 Durham Avenue and 39 Southwark Avenue from MRZ to LCZ.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Matthew Morley	174.2	Oppose	Rezoning 6 Durham Avenue from MRZ (Medium-density Residential Zone) to Local Centre Zone (LCZ). The current use is a commercial activity. The current and future use of the subject site is consistent with the purpose of the LCZ, and rezoning the sites would enable the sites to be used and redeveloped as planned more easily. The sites are on an urban connector road, close to the Tamatea residential area, and will enable local services to be provided to the local community.	Rezoning 6 Durham Avenue from MRZ to LCZ.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Simon Bradshaw	182.1	Amend	Generally supports the General Residential Zoning extent at Parklands, Orotu Drive. However, in the Area D of Parklands (refer full submission), a new commercial node is proposed to provide amenities for the residents in the immediate walkable catchment. Therefore a Neighbourhood Centre Zone is sought for the proposed location of this commercial node. This is consistent with the purpose of the Neighbourhood Centre zone and will not compete with higher order centres in the retail hierarchy. Instead, it will assist in providing a quality living environment which is a key objective for residential zones and for Parklands more specifically.	Retain the General Residential Zone for Parklands with the exception of the commercial node for Area D to be rezoned to Neighbourhood Centre (refer full submission).	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Jillian Meier	186.1	Amend	Amend multi storey developments due to invasion of privacy, decreased value and aesthetic of submitters neighbourhood.	Seeks to exclude Carnell Street from HRZ.  The reasons are stated in the full submission.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Angela McFlynn	189.45	Amend	Considers that in order to achieve well-functioning urban environments as required by the NPS-UD, the District Plan should ensure that medium and high density residential zones are appropriately located in close proximity to all of the following: parks, schools, commercial areas, and community services. As the population of Napier is not sufficient to support full reliance on public transport, medium and high density development should be directed to locations that are within walking distance (500m-700m) of all of these facilities. This also requires greater flexibility in the type of commercial / retail activities that can establish within local community centres to support residents.	Seeks a review of the proposed location of Medium and High Density Zones (MRZ, HRZ) to ensure that future residents of these areas will have ready access to services and facilities within a reasonable (walkable) distance to support the intensification of development.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Planning Maps	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	195.1	Amend	Notes that the AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Zone is mapped to cover the full extent of the Lagoon Farm Site north of Prebensen Drive. Notes that the masterplan for the Ahuriri Regional Park has not yet been prepared so parts of the site may not be required to facilitate the development of the regional park and achieve the objectives of the AESZ needed for the park. Considers that there may be opportunity for a part of the Site to be rezoned for alternative uses. Seeks reconsideration of final zoning of the Site following completion of the masterplan.	Rezoning part of the land identified as AESZ - Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater for alternative uses following completion of the Ahuriri Regional Park Masterplan.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.7	Amend	The PDP only enables development of Jervoistown in accordance with the "unserved" provisions of the operative district plan (ODP) i.e. minimum 2,500sqm sites due to the requirement to provide for onsite wastewater discharge, and the potential cumulative stormwater management challenges for higher intensity development. However, the ODP also includes a structure plan allowing for full urbanization in the event a clear majority (75%) of land owners want this option, and agree to pay for the full urban services to be put in place. Adding a new "Jervoistown Development Area" consistent with Appendix 28C of the ODP, which could be triggered via Council resolution where 75% of landowners agree to pursue urbanization of Jervoistown, will retain this option for landowners into the future.	Add a new "Jervoistown Development Area" to the full extent of the Jervoistown precinct.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.11	Amend	The rezoning of land at 85A Battery Rd, Te Atū St, Coronation ST and Tangaroa St to General Industrial Zone from Mixed Use Zone is intended to recognise existing activities on the site. However the activities enabled by this zone may not be appropriate for the adjacent residential activities. Suggest a new precinct to enable activities appropriate for this site.	Add a new precinct to the subject land to reflect the industrial activity provisions of the Mixed Use zone including range of permitted industrial activities and the permitted building height.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.12	Amend	The proposed Rural Lifestyle zone purpose and provisions do not facilitate ongoing use of residential land (zoned Rural Settlement in the Operative District Plan) at Bay View. The rezoning appears to have been a mapping error.	Rezoning land at Bay View zoned Rural Settlement in the Operative District Plan and Rural Lifestyle in the Proposed District Plan, to Settlement zone. Refer attached map for extent (See full submission).	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.22	Amend	The extent of the Napier City Heritage precinct in the notified PDP does not reflect the expert assessment reports that support having additional design control and management of buildings within the area. The precinct should be clearly defined to include the areas of the City Centre zone and Open Space Zone with heritage values.	Redefine the extent of the Napier City Heritage precinct as per the attached map (see full submission).	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.32	Amend	Cemeteries - Schedule 8.Reasons: The cemeteries listed in Schedule 8 of the District Plan are not identified on the planning maps, reducing clarity for plan users.	Add the cemeteries listed in Schedule 8 of the Plan as a "Cemetery Control Area".	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.34	Amend	Marine Industrial ZoneThe Marine Industry Zone applies to land subject to the Reserves Act and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. Making marine industry permitted does not necessarily give effect to the Reserves Management Plan or NZCPS. Some assessment is appropriate. Further, non-marine industry activities may also be appropriate in this location. Marine industry such as boat building can also locate in other industrial zones, it is not essential they always have direct water access. The Boat Harbour Zone provisions are therefore appropriate to consider this balance of activities and potential impacts on the coastal environment.	Rezoning land identified as "Marine Industry Special Zone" at Meeanee Quay to "Boat Harbour Zone".	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.36	Amend	Open Space Zone.The Open Space zone provisions refer to the Marine Parade Recreation Control area however this is not mapped. This should reflect the extent of the Marine Parade Recreation Zone under the Operative District Plan.	Map the "Marine Parade Recreation Control Area" consistent with the extent of the Marine Parade Recreation Zone under the Operative District Plan.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.40	Amend	A full review of the zoning of NCC Parks & Reserves has identified inaccurate zoning for a number of parcels. It is appropriate for the Open Space and Recreation zoning for each site to be consistent with the function of Council reserves to enable an integrated approach to management of these parks and reserves.	Rezoning land according to the attached schedule (see full submission).	Open Submission



# Planning Maps

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Planning Maps	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.41	Amend	Taradale Library ZoningTaradale Library (located at Lot 2 DP 25696) is proposed to be zoned High Density Residential. This is not appropriate for the use of the site as it would not facilitate extensions or redevelopment of the library. An alternative zoning should be considered.	Rezone Taradale Library (Lot 3 DP 25696) to Town Centre Zone, Open Space Zone, or alternative relief to recognize the use and occupation of the site for community facilities.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.64	Amend	Not all overlays, control areas, zones etc are snapped to property boundaries. This is necessary to ensure clarity in implementation. There will be some exemptions where overlays deliberately cross through boundaries due to the expert evidence supporting their spatial extent. Further, some layers still show "draft" – this should be removed.	Check that boundaries of planning layers are snapped to property boundaries where appropriate.  Remove references to "draft" on layers.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.65	Amend	The Port Zone refers to a Rock Fall Hazard Specific Control Area however the extent of this has not been mapped on the planning maps.	Add the mapped extent of the Rock Fall Hazard Specific Control Area (see Attachment 6), or alternatively delete Rule PORTZ-R6.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.67	Amend	Major Hazard Facility Risk Management OverlayThe Major Hazard Facility Risk Management Overlay referred to in HAZS-R4 is labelled as Significant Hazardous Facility Risk Management in the planning maps. These should be consistent for clarity in plan implementation.	Re-label as "Major Hazard Facility Risk Management Overlay" on the planning maps to be consistent with the relevant rule in the plan.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.79	Amend	EarthworksThe earthworks standard EW-S8 refers to gas lines however these are not located on the planning maps so in implementation it is not clear where the standard applies.	Add gas pipelines as a control line on the planning maps and refer to EW-S8.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Ellen Robotham	198.55	Amend	HBAL's proposed land use management approach within the Aircraft Noise Overlays is such that the ANB is redundant and can be removed from the Proposed Plan.  The mapped extent of the OCB should be consistent with that provided in the Figure 4 of the Marshall Day Acoustics (refer to Appendix 4).	Delete the ANB from the Proposed Plan and ensure the mapped extent of the OCB is as per Figure 4 of the Marshall Day Acoustic Report (attached).  Rename the OCB to the "Aircraft Noise Overlay" to ensure consistency with the NZ Planning Standards.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Mike Doesburg	209.1	Oppose	Opposes the zoning of 68 Franklin Road as Rural Production Zone for the reasons identified in the submission.	Amend the zoning of 68 Franklin Road to General Residential or Settlement Zone.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Mike Doesburg	209.2	Oppose	Opposes the zoning of existing residential development in Bay View as Rural Lifestyle/Settlement Zone for the reasons set out in the attached document.	Amend the zoning of existing residential development in Bay View to General Residential.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Holly Jenkins	214.1	Amend	Supports the creation of quality commercial centres that service the needs of the surrounding residential catchments subject to the centre's position in the Centres Hierarchy. Considers the site specific zoning or small areas are ineffective to develop into centres that are of sufficient size to achieve the objectives and policies of the Commercial Zones (specifically, LCZ). Seeks the extension of LCZ boundaries. Refer to original submission for reasons and referenced market study.	Increase the size of smaller LCZ areas and implement consequential amendments to the zoning of surrounding sites.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Georgina McPherson	215.93	Support	The Fuel Companies support the extent of the Major Hazard Facility Risk Management Overlay.	Retain the Major Hazard Facility Risk Management Overlay extent as notified.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Georgina McPherson	215.173	Support	The Fuel Companies support the extent of the proposed Hazardous Facility Risk Management Overlay as shown around the fuel terminals.	Retain mapping of the Hazardous Facility Risk Management Overlay as proposed.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Georgina McPherson	215.174	Oppose	The Fuel Companies note that there are some clear inaccuracies in the mapping of overland flow paths at existing Fuel Company sites, including where overland flow paths are shown as running through existing buildings and through a bunded compound at the Z Energy terminal.  Maps that have regulatory effect should be sufficiently accurate for their purpose and should not place a burden on landowners and applicants to disprove that the map is correct.Further, any amendment to the planning maps to correct the mapping of overland flow paths, for example where more detailed information may be produced through a consenting process, would require a plan change. That will make it difficult and costly to respond to updated information.	Delete the mapping of overland flow paths from the Planning Maps and include it instead on Council's GIS maps.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Anitha Premraj Sam Goddard	216.12	Support	Supports the zoning of 5 Thackeray Street, Napier South as Mixed Use Zone	Retain zoning as notified	Open Submission

# Planning Maps

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Planning Maps	Anitha Premraj Sam Goddard	216.12	Support	Supports the zoning of 5 Thackeray Street, Napier South as Mixed Use Zone	Retain zoning as notified	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Anitha Premraj Sam Goddard	216.13	Support	Supports the zoning of 330 Gloucester Street, Taradale of Town Centre Zone	Retain zoning as notified.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Anitha Premraj Sam Goddard	216.13	Support	Supports the zoning of 330 Gloucester Street, Taradale of Town Centre Zone	Retain zoning as notified.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Shravan Miryala	217.17	Support	Supports Mixed use zoning of Z Kennedy Road – 226 Tennyson Street, Napier South but considers there is a tension between existing service stations and zonings that are pedestrian and streetscape orientated. Notes that service stations and truck stops are by nature vehicle orientated and whilst these developments can be attractive, they have functional requirements which mean that they do not conform to traditional “streetscape” standards (e.g.: provision of verandahs and building to the front boundary).	Retain the Mixed Use Zoning of the listed Z site.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Shravan Miryala	217.18	Amend	Acknowledges the rolled-over ODP Mixed Use zoning of 85A Battery Road, Ahuriri but considers that, given the hazardous materials associated with the Terminal activity within the wider site, Industrial Zoning will be more appropriate. Considers that, if developed to standard MUZ-S4: Frontages, MU Zoning of the southern part of the Terminal (adjacent to Battery Road), may create an incongruous development when considered in the context of Battery Road, a mainly residential road. Considers that the section 32 evaluation provides no specific reasoning for retaining Mixed Use Zone for this portion of the site. Also considers that different activity status/ rules and objectives and policies of each of the Zones will need to be considered if it is split zoned .	Amend MUZ to GIZ.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Shravan Miryala	217.27	Support	Supports zoning of Z Taradale Service Station 21 Lee Road, Taradale, Napier 4112 as it is considered appropriate in a wider sense but there is an inherent tension between service stations and zonings that are pedestrian, and streetscape orientated. Notes that service stations are by nature vehicle orientated and whilst these developments can be attractive, they have functional requirements which mean that they do not conform to traditional “streetscape” standards (e.g.: provision of verandahs and building to the front boundary).	Retain the zoning of the Z Taradale Service Station site.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Shravan Miryala	217.36	Support	Supports zoning of Z - Napier - Truck Stop 35 & 37 Dunlop Road, Napier	Retain GIZ zoning for the site.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Shravan Miryala	217.37	Amend	Supports the proposed GIZ that reflects the lawfully established activities on this site but opposes the proposed Mixed Use Zoning along the Battery Road frontage. Acknowledging that the site is zoned Mixed Use under the Operative Plan it is considered that Industrial Zoning will be more appropriate given the hazardous materials associated with the Terminal activity within the wider site. Furthermore, the MU Zoning of the southern part of the Terminal (adjacent to Battery Road), if developed to MUZ-S4, may create an incongruous development when considered in the context of Battery Road, a mainly residential road. Notes that the section 32 evaluation does not contain reasoning for retaining Mixed Use Zone for this portion of the site. Also considers that different activity status/ rules and objectives and policies for each of the Zones will need to be considered if the site is split zoned.	Retain GIZ zoning for the site. Amend MUZ to GIZ.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Shravan Miryala	217.38	Support	Supports the zoning of Caltex – Diesel Stop 34 Severn Street, Pandora	Retain GIZ zoning for the site.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Shravan Miryala	217.49	Support	Supports zoning of Caltex – Hyderabad 12 Hyderabad Road, Marewa as the LIZ provides for and accommodates a range of activities, with a limited focus on pedestrians and the provision of public spaces. It allows for large areas or car parking and/or outdoor storage and acknowledges the potential presence of hazardous substances.	Retain LIZ zoning of the site as notified	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Planning Maps	Shravan Miryala	217.58	Oppose	Opposes the zoning of 6 Durham Street as Medium Density Residential and requests that the planning maps be amended to re-zone the site as Local Centre Zone to be more appropriate for the existing service station activity located here. Notes that the purpose of the Local Centre Zone is to 'provide for a range of commercial and community activities to service the needs of the residential catchment.' and the existing service station activity at 6 Durham Avenue fits this purpose and provides services to meet the needs of the community. Also notes that the site is adjacent to a Pak n Save Grocery Store and Service Station. Considers there is no reason why the two service stations should be zoned differently. Considers that a Commercial Zoning is more appropriate than Residential Zoning for the existing commercial service station activity at 6 Durham Avenue. Considers that an extension of the Local Centre Zone from the Corner of Coventry Avenue and Leicester Avenue to 6 Durham Avenue is logical and fits with the nature of the activities in the area to service the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Rezone the parcel of land at 6 Durham Avenue as Local Centre Zone. Refer to original submission for attached image	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Shravan Miryala	217.67	Amend	Considers that the proposed zoning for Caltex Taradale 368 Gloucester Street, Taradale does not reflect the existing and the long-established non-residential use of the site as a service station.	No specific relief sought..	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Amelia Longley	222.58	Amend	Amendment requested to include additional Indicative Access Routes to protect and provide for protection and development of critical linkages to the network, as discussed further in Public Access submissions.	Addition of routes identified in this map ArcGIS Enterprise - Indicative Public Access Route (napier.govt.nz)	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Amelia Longley	222.82	Amend	In relation to Rule SARZ-R6 Park Island Development Area should be included on the Planning Maps.	Amend to identify Park Island Development Area on the Planning Maps.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Alicia McKinnon	230.1	Amend	Considers that the boundaries of the proposed new Ahuriri Mixed Use Zone and the General Industrial Zone in the Planning Maps for the PDP are impractical and will create compliance and enforcement challenges for different activities at 85 Battery Road given the proximity of established Residential Zoning and as such will require amendment.	(The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Alicia McKinnon	230.2	Oppose	Opposes the boundaries of the proposed new Ahuriri Mixed Use Zone and General Industrial Zone in the PDP Planning Maps as being impractical. Considers that they should be amended so that the Ahuriri Mixed Use Zone is retained for land adjoining the bulk oil facilities along Coronation and Tangaroa Streets and for approximately half the land at 85 Battery Road closest to the Residential Zone.	Seeks to amend the Planning Maps so that a specified area remains as a (MUZ) Mixed Use Zone to avoid compliance and enforcement challenges for different activities at 85 Battery Road without any amendment.(The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.1	Amend	Submitter refers to an attached document for their full submission. Submitter outlines the bases of their submission and states they have interest in the parts of the plan that either directly or indirectly, have the potential to impact on the Ministry's interests such as the management and operation of existing educational facilities or the establishment of new educational facilities. The submitter then provides a list of provisions that impact them along with a little detail.Refer to Submission for full details.	Seeks that Amendments requested within the submission points are made. Explains that he Ministry's relief sought is shown in red underscore for additions and red strikethrough for deletions.For further detail is referred to in a document attached to the submission.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.1	Amend	Submitter refers to an attached document for their full submission. Submitter outlines the bases of their submission and states they have interest in the parts of the plan that either directly or indirectly, have the potential to impact on the Ministry's interests such as the management and operation of existing educational facilities or the establishment of new educational facilities. The submitter then provides a list of provisions that impact them along with a little detail.Refer to Submission for full details.	Seeks that Amendments requested within the submission points are made. Explains that the Ministry's relief sought is shown in red underscore for additions and red strikethrough for deletions.  For further detail is referred to in a document attached to the submission.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Peter Holley	235.1	Oppose	Oppose the walking track shown on the planning maps (and refer full submission) that does not appear to have any purpose or destination and which is not part of the walking track network shown in the Mission Structure Plan APP7(a).	Delete the walking track from the planning maps as shown in the full submission.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Planning Maps	Peter Holley	235.2	Amend	<p>Amend the underlying zoning of the south eastern most area of Mission Rural Residential Precinct to General Residential Zone; and change the precinct applying to that area to a new Mission Church Road Residential Precinct, for the reasons set out in the section 32 report appended to this submission (refer full submission). The changes requested within the new Mission Church Road Residential Precinct will provide for an indicative yield is 48 residential properties. Full details as to the reasons for requesting these changes are outlined in the s.32 report, however a summary of these are outlined below:</p> <p>the proposed changes progress the best value of land-use mix and presents an opportunity to provide for residential development at a greater density than enabled by the underlying Rural Lifestyle Zone;                      the land has limited productive value;                      The land is generally higher in elevation and is therefore less susceptible to natural hazards than much of urban Napier;                      the land is located immediately opposite existing residential land and the currently developing Mission Residential Precinct behind it;                      the proposal is generally consistent with relevant PDP policy direction (particularly DEV3);                      technical supporting information demonstrates feasibility;                      four reasonably practicable options have been considered, and it has been found that the proposed approach is the most effective and efficient;                      there are a number of environmental, economic, social and cultural benefits, as well as costs (as detailed in the s.32 report).</p>	Rezone approximately 7.15ha of the south eastern most area of Mission Rural Residential Precinct (at 198 Church Road) to General Residential Zone, and change the precinct overlay to a new Mission Church Road Residential Precinct. Refer full submission to identify where this rezoning refers to.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Peter Holley	235.14	Amend	<p>Amend the urban limit boundary overlay to include the requested Mission Church Road Residential Precinct and Artisan Village Areas for the reasons explained in the Section 32 Report provided in the full submission (refer full submission for more detail).</p> <p>A summary of the reasons for requesting the change can be found in submission point 235.2.</p>	Amend the urban limit boundary to include the new development areas of the Mission Church Road Residential Precinct and Artisan Village as identified on the attached APP7(a)&(b) maps (refer to full submission for more detail).	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Sam Goddard	238.21	Support	Supports Mixed Use Zone for Pak'nSave Napier 25 Munroe Street, Napier South	Retain zoning as notified	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Sam Goddard	238.22	Support	Supports Local Centre Zone for Pak'nSave Tamatea Leicester Avenue & Coventry Avenue, Tamatea	Retain zoning as notified	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Sam Goddard	238.23	Oppose	Opposes Medium Density Residential zoning for 6 and 8 Durham Avenue, Tamatea	Rezone sites to Local Centre Zone to reflect current land uses and match the zoning of the area to the south of the sites. Refer to original submission for attached image	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Sam Goddard	238.24	Amend	Support Local Centre Zone Oppose residential zoning of western portion of site - New World Onekawa 34 Maadi Road, Onekawa	Retain Local Centre zoning of the eastern portion of the site Rezone western portion of the site from residential zone to Local Centre zone to be consistent with zoning of the remainder of the site as this is currently used as car parking for the supermarket activity. Refer to original submission for attached image.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Sam Goddard	238.25	Amend	Support Local Centre Zone Oppose residential zoning of northern portion of site - New World Greenmeadows 9 Gloucester Street, Greenmeadows	Retain Local Centre zoning of the southern portion of the site. Rezone northern portion of the site and sites at 1-8 Auckland Road from residential zone to Local Centre zone to be consistent with zoning of the remainder of the site as parts of this area are currently used as car parking and loading areas for the supermarket activity. See original submission for attached image.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Sam Goddard	238.26	Support	Support General Industrial Zoning for Gilmours Onekawa, 39 Edmunson Road, Onekawa	Retain General Industrial zoning of the site.	Open Submission

# Planning Maps

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Planning Maps	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.120	Support	Supports the GIZ - General Industrial Zone over the land at 19 Severn Street, Pandora, Napier 4110 as Ravensdown's Severn Street Store is located at 19 Severn Street. It is located within the Pandora industrial area. This zoning reflects the nature of activities that take place at this site, and the surrounding land. It is also acknowledged that there are a number of other overlays that apply to the site or parts of the site (i.e., liquefaction vulnerability, high land transport noise area and a Statutory Acknowledgement (Area of Interest)).	Retain the GIZ - General Industrial Zone over the land at 19 Severn Street, Pandora, Napier.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.121	Support	Supports retaining the PORTZ - Port Zone on the area associated with the Port of Napier as one of Ravensdown's two stores in the city is located within the area associated with port activities. This zoning reflects the nature of activities that take place at the port. It is also acknowledged that there are a number of other overlays that apply to the port or parts of the port (i.e., liquefaction vulnerability, high land transport noise area and overland flow paths).	Retain the PORTZ - Port Zone on the area associated with the Port of Napier.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.122	Amend	<p>Considers Ravensdown's landholding at Awatoto located between the state highway and Waitangi Road that is zoned GIZ - General Industrial should be retained. This zoning reflects the nature of development that is in place and the nature of industrial activities that take place at the Napier Works.</p> <p>Ravensdown also owns two parcels of land which are located to the west of Waitangi Road and thus to the west of the developed part of the Napier Works. The two land parcels, which cover an area of 17.574ha, are legally described as Lot 6 DP 25683 (RT HBV4/1002) and Lot 7 DP 25683 (RT HBV4/1002). As discussed earlier in the submission, rezoning through amendment of this land from Rural Production Zone (RPROZ) to GIZ is requested. As rezoning this land would help to future proof Ravensdown's operations at Awatoto and give them more confidence for future decisions on their operations and investments in the area, while also providing flexibility around any potential redevelopment that may be undertaken at the Napier Works.</p>	Retain the GIZ - General Industrial Zone over the land associated with Ravensdown's Napier Works at 90 Waitangi Road, Awatoto AND, Rezone Lot 6 DP 25683 (RT HBV4/1002) and Lot 7 DP 25683 (RT HBV4/1002) from RPROZ - Rural Production Zone to GIZ - General Industrial Zone.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.123	Amend	Considers that at all three of Ravensdown's sites, the online planning maps, identify the sites as being within the 'urban limit (main residential)'. While the 'urban limit' tag is logical in that industrial and port zoned land does form part of the urban environment (and not part of the rural environment), the sub-grouping of 'main residential' seems to be an error (i.e., industrial zoned land cannot be characterised as residential land). Accordingly, amendments are requested, or clarification, on this overlay and its associated sub-grouping descriptor.	<p>Amend the 'urban limit' overlay on the planning maps so that the descriptor accurately reflects the underlying zones (i.e., industrial at Ravensdown's Napier Works and Severn Street Store and port at its Port Store)</p> <p>OR,</p> <p>Delete the 'main residential' sub-grouping from the overlay.</p>	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.124	Oppose	<p>Opposes the extent of the CE - Coastal Environment that is mapped as the 'Coastal Environmental Overlay' in the PDP's planning maps, with the introduction to the CE chapter of the PDP stating that the overlay recognises "the characteristics and features where coastal processes, influences and qualities are significant".</p> <p>Part of the CE - Coastal Environmental Overlay traverses GIZ land in Awatoto, including land which forms part of Ravensdown's Napier Works. It is considered that applying the Coastal Environmental Overlay over industrial zoned land, which is already characterised by industrial activities (i.e., Ravensdown's Napier Works), is not consistent with the resource management intent for the CE or the GIZ (as reflected in relevant objectives and policies for these environments and zones). For these reasons, the CE - Coastal Environmental Overlay should be removed from GIZ - General Industrial Zone land in Awatoto.</p>	Delete the part of the CE - Coastal Environmental Overlay that traverses the General Industrial Zone at Awatoto.	Open Submission

# Planning Maps

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Planning Maps	Phil Stickney	247.39	Oppose	Seeks the inclusion of a Riverbend Road Development Area to manage the development of the Riverbend Road land holdings. Notes that a bespoke suite of Issues, Objectives and Policies along with provisions has been developed. Supports in part the matters contained within the Introductory section. Considers the scope of the provisions in the DEV Area sought are sufficient to guide development on the sites and will also enable the currently identified constraints and the mitigatory measures already tested and proposed to be embedded as part of the development. (Refer to original submission for full details and attachment).	Include a new DEV4 - Riverbend Road Development Area.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Phil Stickney	247.40	Amend	Considers that an amendment to the underlying zone of Rural Production should be changed to Medium Density Residential, Local Centre Zone and Rural Production Zone to enable a new Development Area be added to the Riverbend Road Development Area, as per the map in Appendix 2 of the submission (between Riverbend Road and Waterworth Ave)	Amend the planning maps to rezone this area and to include an additional development area.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Gary Jack French	251.1	Amend	Objects to the inclusion of Carnell Street in High Density residential Zones (HRZ).	Inferred Relief Sought - Seeks to remove Carnell Street from HRZ.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Trevor Ellis	253.4	Amend	The Proposed Plan includes titles for its objectives and policies. In some cases, this title does not reflect the content of the Objective or Policy.	seeks for titles to be amended to ensure that they reflect the content of the provision.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Trevor Ellis	253.106	Amend	considers that 7 Main North Road should be zoned natural open space to mirror the fact it is PCL – or have a special agreement with DOC so it doesn't undermine airport safety but still maintains conservation values. The area is fenced off, and is marsh land with wetland and avian values and should be reflected as such. An agreement between DOC and the Airport to manage the land in a way that does not compromise airport safety is paramount.	seeks to amend 7 Main North Road property to be mapped as natural open space zone and airport zone.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Phil Stickney	263.30	Amend	The Submitter has a specific interest in a number of larger sites on Napier Hill which fall under the aforementioned GRZ Zone and PREC-3 provisions. These highly modified sites have historically been used for healthcare services with larger buildings constructed by the Government, including the former multi storey nurses' hostel which has only recently been demolished. This site in particular represents a significant opportunity, on a vacant site, for a comprehensive residential development however that is not enabled by the provisions of the GRZ, or the provisions associated with the PREC3 - Napier Hill / Mataruahou Amenity Precinct. given their size and location they can offer an opportunity for an efficient use of larger sites for higher density residential development, visitor accommodation, residential care, and retirement uses.	Rezone the following sites to enable higher density development: a) 20A/B Hospital Terrace, b) 186 Battery Road, c) 79 Napier terrace, d) 102 Chaucer Road, e) 2 sixty fifth St and f) 2 Parade Street.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Phil Stickney	263.78	Amend	Extend the LFRZ over the sites as denoted in Appendix 2 (see full submission) including retaining those sites already zoned as LFR in the Operative Plan as denoted in Appendix 2. Amend the Rural Production Zone to an Open Space Zone and a General Industrial Zone as denoted in Appendix 2 (see full submission).	No relief sought. Inferred relief sought is to rezone land at Prebsensen Drive/Severn Street as per the submission point above.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Phil Stickney	263.79	Amend	Rezone 20 Hospital Terrace and a part of 186 Battery Road from General Residential Zone and PREC3 to Medium Density Residential Zone (see Appendix 2 of full submission). Rezone 79 Napier Terrace and 102 Chaucer Road North from General Residential Zone and PREC3 to High Density Zone (see Appendix 2 of full submission). Rezone 2 Sixty Fifth Street and 2 Parade Street from General Residential Zone and PREC3 to Medium Density Residential Zone (see Appendix 2 of full submission).	No relief sought but inferred relief sought is as follows:  Rezone 20 Hospital Terrace and a part of 186 Battery Road from General Residential Zone and PREC3 to Medium Density Residential Zone (see Appendix 2 of full submission).  Rezone 79 Napier Terrace and 102 Chaucer Road North from General Residential Zone and PREC3 to High Density Zone (see Appendix 2 of full submission).  Rezone 2 Sixty Fifth Street and 2 Parade Street from General Residential Zone and PREC3 to Medium Density Residential Zone (see Appendix 2 of full submission).	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Planning Maps	Phil Stickney	263.80	Amend	Re-zone 80 Auckland Road to from General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone as denoted in Appendix 2 of the full submission.	No relief sought however it is inferred that the submitter seeks to re-zone 80 Auckland Road to from General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone as denoted in Appendix 2 of the full submission.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.61	Support	Supports the identification, protection and management of heritage Precincts, identified by an Overlay on the District Plan Maps. The general approach to the management of these heritage areas is supported. This section of the District Plan appears to contain several typing mistakes, which should be corrected.	Retain heritage Precinct / Overlay provisions, subject to typo correction amendments.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Bruce Cameron Morrin	276.1	Amend	Amend to exclude Nelson Crescent and the western side of Wellesley Road from being a (HRZ) High Density Residential Zone. Suggests the Street should be classified as a heritage area to protect its character.	Seeks to remove Nelson Crescent and the western side of Wellesley Road from HRZ. Retain current fence heights. The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.81	Amend	Support use of the state highway noise boundary as a tool to manage reverse sensitivity however, the symbol should align with national planning standards.	Rename 'High Land Transport Noise Boundary' to ' <u>Land transport noise control boundary overlay</u> ' Amend map notation to align with national planning standards	Open Submission
Planning Maps	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.161	Amend	NZTA supports the inclusion of state highway designations on the planning maps; however, several sections of the notified state highway designations need to be spatially represented accurately on the planning maps as noted below:  Considers that modification of designation boundaries is needed in discrete locations to encompass the full width of existing operational road corridors. Notes that these sections are integral to the state highway network but are not currently legal roads. In most cases, these discrepancies are historical in nature and modifying the designation boundary through the district plan process allows an opportunity to rectify those. Proposed modifications aim to designate existing formed and operational state highway infrastructure not in private use. Corrections are required to align designation boundaries with the most current NZ Primary Road Parcel boundaries maintained by Toitū Te Whenua Land Information New Zealand (LINZ). Geospatial designation shapefiles provided to Council in March 2023 are now out of alignment with the current NZ Primary Road Parcel boundaries along some sections of state highway. Amendments are necessary at intersections with local roads to ensure continued maintenance of the state highway network. Refer to Appendix 4 for examples of where the state highway designation boundaries will need to be corrected to align with the most current legal road boundaries and where the proposed designation will need to be widened to cover the formed and operational road.	NZTA requests that:  the state highway designation geospatial shapefiles be widened in discrete places to cover the formed and operational road and to enable the continuing maintenance of the state highway network; and that the state highway designation geospatial shapefiles be corrected to align with the most up to date legal road boundaries.  Refer Appendix 4 for examples of where the state highway designation boundaries will need to be corrected to align with the most current legal road parcel boundaries. Submitter will provide Council with the corrected geospatial files in due course.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Planning Maps	Phil Stickney	279.2		Notes that the submission is made regarding land accommodating Maraenui Golf Club and Awatoto Golf Course. Notes that Maraenui Club is privately operated while Awatoto Course is public. Notes that both courses were significantly damaged during Cyclone Gabrielle, with efforts made to reinstate the Awatoto Course. Notes the proposed zoning under the Proposed plan: Open Space Zone (OSZ) for part of the sites and Rural Production Zone (RPZ) for the southern extent accomodating the Awatoto Course. Considers that there is no rationale for a “split” zoning over the land given the established land use activities that are undertaken are both recreational activities. Seeks to zone all land encapsulated by golfing activities as OSZ. Considers that the proposed provisions do not reflect the bespoke nature of activities associated with, and required for a golfing land use, which clearly are of a very specific nature. Considers that Rules and Standards for OSZ-R and OSZ-S are too restrictive for golf club activities. Notes the scale of buildings required to support a viable golfing activity and the supporting range of land use activities which are expected including cafes/bar facilities, a golfing goods retail operation, storage facilities and other ancillary infrastructure. Seeks provisions that accommodate golfing activities' specific nature as they also attract the public. Seeks amendment of OSZ provisions or creation of a new Golf Precinct to better manage golfing activities using a bespoke approach. Considers the intention to make the plan more effective in achieving desired outcomes and providing certainty and direction for these activities to avoid adverse environmental effects. Refer to original submission for full reasons.	Seeks that the mapping and provision of a golf precinct and accepted and adopted into the PDP and including such further, alternative, or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in this submission. Notes that changes are aimed at ensuring the proposed provisions align with the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, simplifying interpretation and processing for decision makers, provide clarity for all plan users, and promoting certainty in future planning. Refer to original submission for attached Appendix 1 PREC11 – Golf Course Precinct and Appendix 2 - Precinct Map and zone changes sought	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Alan Petersen	281.1	Oppose	The site is a long narrow strip of 1.4km & 60 to 70m wide. The site is surrounded on three sides by urban development. The property has never been utilised for productive purposes, it is in the Coastal Environment therefore often subject to salt spray which will affect many rural activities such as orcharding. The property is subject to a coastal hazard zone determined by the Environmental Court in 2006. A coastal scientist has recently determined that this part of the coast has not been subject to erosion for about 50 years. The site is not in any flood maps.	Seeks that the property at 68 Franklin Road be rezoned to Rural Lifestyle.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Alan Petersen	281.26	Amend	Rezoning 68 Franklin Road to General Residential Zone. The development (to a large part) applies with the standards of the General Residential Zone, is serviced, and has resource consent.	Rezoning 68 Franklin Road to General Residential Zone.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Alan Petersen	281.27	Amend	Rezoning the urban areas of Bay View that are proposed to be zoned Rural Lifestyle in the PDP and are zoned Rural Settlement Zone in the ODP to General Residential Zone. The residential areas of Bay View are clearly urban in nature and should be zoned in a way that reflects that.	Rezoning the urban areas of Bay View that are proposed to be zoned Rural Lifestyle in the PDP and are zoned Rural Settlement Zone in the ODP to General Residential Zone.	Open Submission



Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
Planning Maps	Matthew Holder	283.1	Oppose	Opposes 162 Waghorne Street being within a Heritage Reserve Historic Overlay. This submission relates to the land (and immediate environs) area at 162 Waghorne Street, Ahuriri. Supports the exclusion of the site from an amenity precinct in the Proposed District Plan. Acknowledges that there are buildings within this Heritage Reserve Historic Overlay area that have some historic value, however considers that the restrictive rule framework erodes the ability to prevent development and redevelopment. Considers that buildings within this proposed area should be individually identified rather than group in a "catch all" contributory manner. Notes that the current District Plan framework does not fully recognise that this area has a mix of buildings and uses- both modern and old. Does not consider the existing dwelling worthy of protection or applying heritage values as it is not identified as a specific heritage item.	Amend or remove the Heritage Rule Framework to allow alterations and extensions at 162 Waghorne Street without the need for resource consent. Supports applying a similar rule framework to the current Rules 56.8 and 56.9 applying to 162 Hardinge Road in the Operative District Plan for 162 Hardinge Road, allowing repair, maintenance, and alterations of heritage items as permitted activities. Considers that that applying blanket heritage rules to the area rather than individual sites is inconsistent with the Resource Management Act's objectives and has not been adequately addressed in Section 32 reporting. Considers that allowing for greater levels of development on the site is considered consistent with the objectives and policies of NPS-UD. The submitter seeks the adoption of specific amendments outlined in the submission by the Napier City Council, aiming to ensure the proposed provisions align with the Resource Management Act, reduce complications for decision-makers, provide clarity for all users, and enable development opportunities consistent with the National Policy Statement for Urban Development.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Matthew Holder	284.1	Amend	Submitter seeks rezoning of properties, at 31, 33, 35 and 39 Marine Parade and encompasses four (4) separate Titles. Submitter provides a general description of the sites and notes that the site is situated at the corner of Marine Parade and Seaview Terrace, nestled against Hukarere Bluff, with buildings facing the sea. Considers that, although proposed to be zoned as General Residential, its characteristics differ from the adjacent Napier Hill area, making it suitable for residential development due to its proximity to the city centre and amenities. Notes that consent was granted for a multilevel residential apartment development, following an appeal to the Environment Court on 29/09/2015. Notes that the proposed development includes a multi-unit residential building with restored Soldiers Club and comprised of 21 individual apartments occurring across 5 levels (excluding basement level). As part of the overall development, it also proposed to restore the Soldiers Club to its original 1916 design. It permitted a maximum building height of 16.810 metres; and a setback approximately 2 metres from the front boundary. An extension to the approved resource consent pursuant to Section 125 of the RMA was then granted on 14/05/2019. The existing consent therefore lapses on 14/05/2024. Though committed to progressing, the approved development has not advanced beyond financial and project management due to various reasons, including the Covid-19 pandemic and Cyclone Gabrielle. Considers that more intensive and greater levels of development (through zoning and rule standards) will provide a cohesive development "fit" within this existing environment and reflect a continuity of this existing pattern as this greater level of development will be 'anchored' between Te Pania Hotel and Tremain house and framed by the large hill backdrop. Height will be dwarfed by the bluff hillside immediately abutting to the West that forms a backdrop to both the immediate and wider area.. Considers that the	Seeks that the land be zoned as City Centre Zone or, alternatively, have a precinct area with specific rules recognizing site characteristics. Submitter provides three forms of proposed mapping to apply not only to the submitter's sites but also to the immediate area for consistency. Considers that the hill area could accommodate greater development, distinct from Napier Hill, including apartments, hotels, visitor accommodation, and offices. Considers that the heritage precinct needs clearer delineation, and the City Fringe Control Area should be amended accordingly. Discrepancies between standards applying under the City Centre zone and the Napier City Heritage Precinct need addressing. Considers that the Napier Hill Mataruahou Amenity Precinct should be located to the rear boundary (top of the hill) of the subject land. Considers that section 32 reporting regarding zoning and rule framework for the subject land and immediate areas is inadequate. The submitter seeks acceptance and adoption of specific amendments, additions, or retentions outlined in the submission and Appendices 1 into the PDP.	Open Submission
Planning Maps	Kainga Ora - Brendon Liggett	285.24	Amend	Submitter generally submits that the plan is amended to ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations as a housing provider; ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991; Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development; Provide clarity for all plan users; and Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.	Generally seeks that the specific amendments, additions or retentions which are sought as specifically outlined in this submission, are accepted and adopted into the PDP, including such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in this submission.	Open Submission