



PLAN CHANGE 11: PARK ISLAND RECONFIGURATION

Operative City of Napier District Plan

Summary of Submissions



NAPIER
CITY COUNCIL
Te Kaunihera o Ahuriri

Introduction

This document summarises the decisions requested or inferred from each submission received on Plan Change 11 to the City of Napier District Plan. Where no decision was specifically requested, Council officers have, where possible, inferred the decision requested from the text of the submission.

Brief description of Plan Change 11: Park Island Reconfiguration

The redesign of the Northern Sports Hub requires a reconfiguration of Residential and Sports Park zonings in the vicinity of Park Island. Plan Change 11 is proposing to rezone the Residential Zone on the southeastern boundary of Park Island to Sports Park Zone, and to rezone much of the current Sports Park Zone in the northeast of Park Island to Main Residential Zone. The rezoning proposals affect planning maps G4, G5, H4 and H5.

A number of minor consequential changes are also proposed. These include:

- Rezoning areas of the Sports Park Zone to a Reserve Zone that already act as reserves, such as the area of land between Prebensen Drive and existing Main Residential Zone,
- Rezoning areas of the Main Residential Zone to Reserve Zone that are now reserves, such as the area in the south east corner of the existing Main Residential Zone alongside Orotu Drive,
- Rezoning the existing link opposite Kapiti Drive from Reserve to Main Residential,
- Rezoning the existing link opposite Pacific Drive from Reserve to Main Residential,
- Rezoning areas of the drainage reserve along Orotu Drive from Main Residential to Reserve now that these areas are no longer required for roading.
- Imposition of a building height restriction to a maximum height of 6 metres within a 30 metre wide strip along the Orotu Drive interface of the newly proposed residential zone
- Recommendation for clustered groupings of specimen trees planted along the western edge of Council owned reserve land along the Orotu Drive interface of the newly proposed residential zone
- Amendment of the existing maximum permitted floor space for buildings (1000m²) within the Park Island Masterplan area to better reflect existing and already identified and anticipated sport facilities and to apply the new maximum (4000m²) on a per sports hub basis rather than the whole of the Masterplan area.
- Inclusion of a new Structure Plan to identify key urban activities and infrastructure to support development of the area subject to the rezoning.

PUBLIC NOTICE UNDER CLAUSE 7 OF SCHEDULE 1 OF THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS TO PLAN CHANGE 11

In accordance with Clause 7 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 a summary of the decisions requested in submissions received to the Plan Change 11 has been prepared:

Public Inspection:

Copies of the summary of submissions on the proposed Plan Change 11 will be available for public viewing from Wednesday 11 April 2018 at:

- www.napier.govt.nz keyword: #planchange11
- Napier City Council Customer Service Centre; and
- Napier City and Taradale Public Libraries;

Any queries or requests for copies of Plan Change 11 can be made to the Napier City Council's City Development team by emailing districtplan@napier.govt.nz or phoning 06 835 7579

Who can make a Further Submission?

Further Submissions are limited to any person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest or any person that has an interest in the plan change greater than the interest the general public has, and can only submit in support or opposition to an original submission that is included in the summary of submissions. Further submissions cannot raise any new issues, but should give detailed reasons for any support or opposition to an original submission.

The closing date for submissions is 12pm, Thursday 26 April 2018

Further submissions should be addressed to the Team Leader Policy Planning and can be made either:

Online: www.napier.govt.nz keyword #planchange11

Emailed to: districtplan@napier.govt.nz

Posted to: Private Bag 6010, Napier 4182

Delivered to: Napier City Council Customer Service Centre, Hastings St, Napier

Any submissions in writing must be in the prescribed format (Form 6) of the Resource Management (Forms, Fees & Procedure) Regulations 2003. A copy of this form is available at the locations listed above.

A copy of the further submission must also be sent to the original submitter within 5 working days of making a further submission to the Council.

Public Participation

After the closing date for further submissions, a Hearing will be held by Council on all of the submissions and further submissions made on Plan Change 11. Following the hearing, the Council will make a decision whether or not to accept each submission or further submission and the reasons for its decision. Any submitter or further submitter has the right to appeal Council's decision to the Environment Court.

Dean Moriarity

TEAM LEADER POLICY PLANNING

Further Submissions

What is a further submission?

A further submission is a written statement made in support or opposition to another person's original submission. Further submissions cannot raise any new issues, but should give detailed reasons for any support or opposition to an original submission.

Who can make a further submission?

Further submissions are limited to any person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest or any person that has an interest in the plan change greater than the interest the general public has.

How do I make a further submission?

If you are eligible to make a further submission, you should take time to understand the original submissions that have been made on Plan Change 11 and how these might affect you. Any submissions in writing must be in the prescribed format (Form 6) of the Resource Management (Forms, Fees & Procedure) Regulations 2003. A copy of this form is available at the locations listed above.

Be specific and use examples where you can. Each original submission has been allocated a number and this number should be included as a reference in your own further submission.

Where do I send my further submission?

Submissions should be addressed to the Team Leader Policy Planning and can be made either:

Online: www.napier.govt.nz keyword #planchange11

Emailed to: districtplan@napier.govt.nz

Posted to: Private Bag 6010, Napier 4182

Delivered to: Napier City Council Reception, Hastings St, Napier

A copy of your further submission must also be sent to the person who made the original submission within 5 working days after making a further submission to the Council.

[Addresses for correspondence are attached to the rear of the Summary of Submissions]

The closing date for submissions is 12pm, Thursday 26 April 2018

What Next?

Following the receipt of further submissions, hearings will be held to consider all submissions. The hearings give those who have made original or further submissions an opportunity to talk about their concerns and provide evidence in support of their submissions. The hearings give submitters an additional chance to be involved in the decision-making process. All hearings are open for the public to attend. Hearings will be conducted by a panel, generally of Councilors or commissioner(s). At the hearing, submitters will be given a chance to explain their submission or further submission and may also be asked questions about their views.

After the hearings, the Council will consider all the information put forward in submissions. It may accept each submission point in full or in part, or the points may be rejected. The City of Napier District Plan will be amended as a result of this consultation and decision making process. If submitters are unhappy with any decisions made as a result of their submissions, they may appeal the Council's decision to the Environment Court.

Summary of Submissions

Plan Change 11: Park Island Reconfiguration

SUPPORT PC11

Submitter Name	Submitter No.	Statement No.	Decision Requested
Central Football	5	1	Supports PC11 but cautions that there should be no more traffic on Clyde Jeffery Drive due to potential hazards and requests that any plans for additional parking off street along Clyde Jeffery Drive be hastened.

SUPPORT IN PART PC11

Submitter Name	Submitter No.	Statement No.	Decision Requested
Hawkes Bay Regional Council	6	1	No specific relief requested but suggests a fuller assessment of policies in the Regional Policy Statement was warranted as part of notification of PC11.
Hawkes Bay Regional Council	6	2	No specific relief requested but suggests the HBRC needs more details on stormwater collection, treatment and disposal to fully understand potential impacts on the quantity of stormwater runoff and water quality of receiving environments. Council should also be aware that there is a natural overland flow path from the Taipo Stream over the existing Park Island Sports Park (Southern Sports Hub) generally towards the development area (the Northern Sports Hub).
Hawkes Bay Regional Council	6	3	Suggests NCC undertake an assessment of the capability of the existing wastewater infrastructure to cope with the potential increase in the number of dwellings and share these findings with the HBRC in order to avoid any further incidents associated with discharge of contaminated stormwater due to network capacity issues.
Hawkes Bay Regional Council	6	4	Suggests that discussions be held with the HBRC regarding the proposal to discharge secondary runoff from the development area to the Ahuriri Estuary via the Purimu pump station through the existing consent for discharge. The intention is to reduce potential contaminants entering the Ahuriri Estuary by way of stormwater design and treatment through low impact designs.
Hawkes Bay Regional Council	6	5	Suggests that due to potential liquefaction risk a geotechnical engineer provide input into the design of all buildings, including a site specific assessment of subsurface ground conditions.
Hawkes Bay Regional Council	6	6	Suggests that due to potential Tsunami inundation risk consideration be given to restricting the location of critical facilities within the development area and design, enhancement and protection of evacuation routes be considered when developing new infrastructure.

SUPPORT IN PART PC11

Submitter Name	Submitter No.	Statement No.	Decision Requested
Launch Active Early Learning	7	1	Supports PC11 but believes provision should be made for an 'early childhood education centre' to be included in Parklands Estate (being the new residential development area).

GENERALLY SUPPORTS PC11 WITH AMENDMENTS

Submitter Name	Submitter No.	Statement No.	Decision Requested
Parklands Neighbourhood Support Group 14A	2	1	Generally supports PC11 albeit with the amendments outlined in their submission (re alternative access, alternative emergence access, additional parking and locating buildings as far away from Orotu Drive as practicable).
Parklands Neighbourhood Support Group 14A	2	2	Vehicle access to the proposed northern sports hub be from Clyde Jeffery Drive (with no access from Orotu Drive).
Parklands Neighbourhood Support Group 14A	2	3	Emergency access to the proposed northern sports hub be from the existing bridge in Westminster Ave.
Parklands Neighbourhood Support Group 14A	2	4	Adequate parking be provided within the sports hubs (notwithstanding recognition of the additional 527 car parks proposed within the Sports Hubs and acceptance that there may be some overflow parking in residential areas during some major national events).
Parklands Neighbourhood Support Group 14A	2	5	Sports buildings should be located as far as practicable from Orotu Drive.

NEUTRAL ON PC11 BUT REQUESTS AMENDMENTS

Submitter Name	Submitter No.	Statement No.	Decision Requested
Nigel MacNeil	3	1	Neutral on PC11 but is concerned about parking on adjacent residential streets so requests: Either provide an additional 100 carparks on the sports hub or alternatively, create an alternative vehicle access to the sports hub via Clyde Jeffery Drive.

**NEUTRAL ON PC11 BUT REQUESTS RECOGNITION BE GIVEN TO POWERCO'S ASSETS
REGARDING SUPPLY OF GAS TO THE AREA**

Submitter Name	Submitter No.	Statement No.	Decision Requested
Powerco	4	1	<p>Neutral on PC11 but seeks to ensure recognition, protection and access to existing assets in the area plus ensure adequate and secure supply of gas can be supplied to new development where required.</p> <p>This would best be achieved by way of early consultation in relation to future development, setting new buildings or structures back a minimum of 2 metres from existing underground pipes, and coordinating Council infrastructure provision with Powerco's gas delivery infrastructure.</p>

OPPOSES PC11

Submitter Name	Submitter No.	Statement No.	Decision Requested
Ron Carswell	1	1	<p>Reject PC11 and consider other options.</p> <p>Residential land to be swapped is ideal for a retirement village.</p> <p>Objects to noise, light spill & traffic flows.</p> <p>Site is unsuited to what is effectively a commercial activity.</p> <p>Consider building a sports hub away from residential areas with good road access and adequate parking</p>



Submissions to the Napier City Council

PLAN CHANGE 11: PARK ISLAND RECONFIGURATION

Submission numbers 1 – 7

- 1 Ron Carswell
- 2 Parklands Neighbourhood Support Group 14A, Ken McKee
- 3 Nigel MacNeil
- 4 Powerco Limited
- 5 Central Football, John McGifford
- 6 Hawkes' Bay Regional Council
- 7 Launch Active Early Learning, Cathy Sherwood



NAPIER
CITY COUNCIL
Te Kōwhiri o Aotearoa

Submission Form DISTRICT PLAN

Office use only:

Submission number:

Date Received:

Database:

Date Entered:

Initials:

SUBMISSIONS ON PLAN CHANGE 11: Park Island Reconfiguration

Form 5, Clause 6 of the first schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

IMPORTANT NOTES FOR SUBMITTERS

Submissions Close: 12pm, Friday 9 February 2018

Submission can be made:

Anyone is invited to make a submission. Submissions can be from an individual or on behalf of an organisation.

Online: www.napier.govt.nz
#planchange11

You may either use this form or prepare your own submission being careful to use the same format.

Email: districtplan@napier.govt.nz

Post: Team Leader Policy Planning
Napier City Council
Private Bag 6010, Napier 4142

Section 1: Applicant Details

Name of Organisation:

Rokopoua

Contact Name:

Ren Casswell

Email:

ronc@roko.co.nz

Address:

24 Akaroa Road Napier

Contact no:

Postcode: 4142

Section 2: Trade competition section

~~Could~~ / could not (select one) gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission
I am / am not (select one) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

- a) Adversely affects the environment; and
- b) Does not relate to trade competition or the effect of trade competition.

*delete entire paragraph if you could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

Section 3: Submission Details

Number of pages attached to this submission:

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?

Yes No

If others make a similar submission, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case?

Yes No

Signature:

Ren Casswell

Date:

8-02-2018

Section 4: Your Submission

The specific provisions of the Plan Change that my submission relates to are:

Give details. Plan change 11

I seek the following decision from Napier City Council:

Give precise details about the amendments you wish to make: e.g. retain provision, delete it, modify it in the following way, etc.

Reject all proposals regarding Plan change 11 and consider other options with the possibility of a more attractive outcome

My submission is:

Include: support/opposition to specific parts of plan change, if you want amendments made, and reasons for your views:

The residential land for the proposed land swap is ideal retirement type residential land. i.e. Proximity to medical centre, shops, services & bus route
I strongly object to the noise pollution, light spill & traffic flows associated with such a proposal that is before us
The proposed site is totally unsuited for what is virtually a commercial activity.
NCC should follow the example of HDC and consider building a similar style Sports Hub away from residential areas and with good road access for the volumes of traffic along with adequate parking
Maybe supporting the Hastings Sports Park would be the perfect solution

Important Information:

1. The council must receive this submission before the closing date and time for submission on this Plan Change or Variation
2. Please note that submissions are public. Your name and submission will be included in papers that are available to the media and the public. Your submission will only be used for the purpose of the Plan Change or Variation process.
3. Only those submitters who indicate they wish to speak at the hearing will be sent a copy of the planning report. A link to the report will be provided to all submitters.



NAPIER
CITY COUNCIL
Te Kaunihera o Ahuriri

Submission Form DISTRICT PLAN

Office use only:

Submission number:

Date Received:

Database:

Date Entered:

Initials:

SUBMISSIONS ON PLAN CHANGE 11: Park Island Reconfiguration

Form 5, Clause 6 of the first schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

IMPORTANT NOTES FOR SUBMITTERS

Submissions Close: 12pm, Friday 9 February 2018

Anyone is invited to make a submission. Submissions can be from an individual or on behalf of an organisation. You may either use this form or prepare your own submission being careful to use the same format.

Submission can be made:

Online: www.napier.govt.nz
#planchange11

Email: districtplan@napier.govt.nz

Post: Team Leader Policy Planning
Napier City Council
Private Bag 6010, Napier 4142

Section 1: Applicant Details

Name of Organisation:	PARKLANDS NEIGHBOURHOOD SUPPORT GROUP 14A	
Contact Name:	KEN MCKEE	
Email:	kkmckee178@hotmail.com	
Address:	2 OROTU DRIVE NAPIER	
Contact no:	06 843 0327	Postcode: 4112

Section 2: Trade competition section

I ~~could / could not~~ (select one) gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission
I ~~am / am not~~ (select one) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:
a) ~~Adversely affects the environment; and~~
b) ~~Does not relate to trade competition or the effect of trade competition.~~

*delete entire paragraph if you could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

Section 3: Submission Details

Number of pages attached to this submission: FIVE

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?

Yes No

If others make a similar submission, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case?

Yes No

Signature:

Date:

5 FEBRUARY 2018

Section 4: Your Submission

The specific provisions of the Plan Change that my submission relates to are:

Give details: *see attached*

I seek the following decision from Napier City Council:

Give precise details about the amendments you wish to make: e.g. retain provision, delete it, modify it in the following way, etc.

see attached

My submission is:

Include: support/opposition to specific parts of plan change, if you want amendments made, and reasons for your views:

see attached

Attach additional pages if required.

Important information:

1. The council must receive this submission before the closing date and time for submission on this Plan Change or Variation
2. Please note that submissions are public. Your name and submission will be included in papers that are available to the media and the public. Your submission will only be used for the purpose of the Plan Change or Variation process.
3. Only those submitters who indicate they wish to speak at the hearing will be sent a copy of the planning report. A link to the report will be provided to all submitters.

Napier City Council
Team Leader Policy Planning
Private Bag 6010
Napier 4182
5 February 2018

Submission - Plan Change 11: Park Island Reconfiguration

Section 1: Applicant Details

Organisation: Parklands Neighbourhood Support Group 14A
Contact Name: Ken McKee
Email: kkmckee178@hotmail.com
Address: 2 Orotu Drive, Napier
Contact Number: 06 843 0327
Postcode: 4112

Introduction:

I am a Registered Engineering Associate and worked for forty years in the field of hydro electric power station construction, maintenance, operation and management, including management of villages, roads and associated infrastructures.

I retired to Napier in 1992 and have lived in Orotu Drive for the last seven years.

Section 4: Submission

The specific provisions of the Plan Change that our submission relates to are:

Whilst we generally support the Plan Change we wish to highlight that there is no direct physical connection provided between the proposed Northern Sports Hub and the Central and Southern Sports Hubs.

We seek the following decision from the Napier City Council:

That the vehicle access to the proposed Northern Sports Hub be from Clyde Jeffery Drive.
And that there be no access from Orotu Drive.

And that an emergency access to the proposed Northern Sports Hub be provided via the existing adjacent bridge in Westminster Avenue. This is a Class 1 bridge.

And adequate parking be provided within the Sports Hubs areas. We are aware that the Plan provides for 527 additional car parks within the Sports Hubs and accept that there may be some overflow parking in residential areas during some major national events.

Our Submission is:

The Napier City Council are proposing substantial residential housing in the Northern part of the area to the West of Orotu Drive and a new Northern Sports Hub in the Southern part. The new Northern Sports Hub provides only one vehicle access and this is proposed to be from the roundabout at the intersection of Orotu and Tasman Drives. This proposed access would physically isolate the Northern Sports Hub from the Central and Southern Sports Hubs and would require costly bridging over the existing Swale Drain.

There is presently insufficient parking in the existing Central and Southern Sports Hubs and this has resulted in many users of these facilities needing to park their vehicles in Westminster Avenue. The residents surveyed in Westminster Avenue are not happy about vehicles parked outside their properties by people attending sports events in the existing Sports Hubs because it changes the residential nature of the area and limits access to their properties.

Also many residents surveyed in Parklands are not happy with the proposed vehicle access to the Northern Sports Hub from Orotu Drive because such an access would result in the overflow of sports traffic parking in the vicinity and limiting access to their properties and changing the residential nature of the area. These residents would like any sports buildings to be located as far as practicable from Orotu Drive so as to maintain their quiet enjoyment and the residential nature of the area.

A significant number of residents adjacent to the existing and proposed Sports Hubs agree that a roadway from Clyde Jeffery Drive to the proposed Northern Sports Hub together with adequate parking within the Sports Hubs should be incorporated in the proposed plan. Clyde Jeffery Drive is a dual carriageway and has good access from Prebensen Drive and Westminster Avenue. Both Prebensen and Westminster are arterial roads.


Such access and parking would keep all traffic to and from the existing and proposed Sports Hubs accommodated within one Sports Hubs area and provide a direct connection for all users. Also such a connection would promote easier communication between all parties organising and playing their various activities. Also this would keep the sports activities separate from the residential communities.

The suggested emergency access via the existing bridge in Westminster Avenue could be critical in the case of a catastrophic event such as serious multiple injuries or major fire.

The access road to the Northern Sports hub from Clyde Jeffery would be through an area presently proposed for planting. There would be no reduction in the overall number of sports fields. Also this access would be less costly than the access proposed from Orotu Drive, which would require costly bridging over the existing Swale Drain.

We would like the Napier City Council to provide suitable vehicle access to and adequate parking within the existing Central, Southern and proposed Northern Sports Hubs with the minimum effect to Parklands and Westminster Avenue residents and at minimum cost to the Council.

ORIGINALLY



Site Analysis:




Park Island, Napier Master Plan

Project: W16038
Scale: 1:6000 @ A3
U:\W16038\GRAPHICS\W16038_001_MASTERPLAN_REPORT_2012



KEY

- Existing Power Poles
- Existing Sealed Walkway
- Existing Informal Walkway
- Proposed Formal Walkway
- Proposed Fences
- Existing lighting (Upgraded or Relocated)
- Proposed lighting
- Proposed Residential Area
- Proposed Playground
- Power line underground
- Proposed Carpark
- Proposed Stream Realignment
- Proposed Bush/Wetland
- Proposed Wetland
- Proposed Trees
- Existing Building
- Proposed Building
- Temporary Accommodation
- Central Football
- Existing Substation
- Game Standard
- Training Standard
- Artificial Turf
- Proposed Pedestrian Crossing



4



NAPIER
CITY COUNCIL
Te Kaunihera o Ahuriri

Submission Form DISTRICT PLAN

Office use only:

Submission number:

Date Received: 7/02/2018

Database:

Date Entered:

Initials: D.M.

SUBMISSIONS ON PLAN CHANGE 11: Park Island Reconfiguration

Form 5, Clause 6 of the first schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

IMPORTANT NOTES FOR SUBMITTERS

Submissions Close: 12pm, Friday 9 February 2018

Anyone is invited to make a submission. Submissions can be from an individual or on behalf of an organisation. You may either use this form or prepare your own submission being careful to use the same format.

Submission can be made:

Online: www.napier.govt.nz
#planchange11

Email: districtplan@napier.govt.nz

Post: Team Leader Policy Planning
Napier City Council
Private Bag 6010, Napier 4142

Section 1: Applicant Details

Name of Organisation:

Contact Name:

NIGEL MACNEIL

Email:

kmacneil@extra.co.nz

Address:

12 OKOTU DRIVE, PARKLANDS ESTATE
NAPIER

Contact no:

06 8352178

Postcode: 4112

Section 2: Trade competition section

I ~~could~~ / could not (select one) gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission
I am / ~~am not~~ (select one) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:
a) Adversely affects the environment; and
b) Does not relate to trade competition or the effect of trade competition.

*delete entire paragraph if you could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

Section 3: Submission Details

Number of pages attached to this submission:

THREE

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?

Yes No

If others make a similar submission, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case?

Yes No UNKNOWN

Signature:

Date:

06.02.2018

Section 4: Your Submission

The specific provisions of the Plan Change that my submission relates to are:

Give details: *THE PROVISION OF AN ADDITIONAL 100 PARKING SPACES
IN THE PROPOSED COMPLEX*

I seek the following decision from Napier City Council:

Give precise details about the amendments you wish to make: e.g. retain provision, delete it, modify it in the following way, etc.

NO ADDITIONAL PARKING ON ORCHARD DRIVE FOR 100 VEHICLES.

My submission is:

Include: support/opposition to specific parts of plan change, if you want amendments made, and reasons for your views:

PLEASE REFER THE ATTACHED

Attach additional pages if required.

Important Information:

1. The council must receive this submission before the closing date and time for submission on this Plan Change or Variation
2. Please note that submissions are public. Your name and submission will be included in papers that are available to the media and the public. Your submission will only be used for the purpose of the Plan Change or Variation process.
3. Only those submitters who indicate they wish to speak at the hearing will be sent a copy of the planning report. A link to the report will be provided to all submitters.

REFERENCE PAGE 27 OF PLAN CHANGE 11

SECTION 32 EVALUATION 17016 AP1

10.11.17

AT PREVIOUS MEETINGS ORGANISED BY THE NAPIER CITY COUNCIL, THERE HAS NEVER BEEN A MENTION OF INADEQUATE PARKING IN THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND THAT AN OVERSPILL OF APPROX 100 VEHICLES WOULD BE ACCOMMODATED ALONG OROTU DRIVE FOR APPROX 600 METRES ON ONE SIDE OF THE ROAD OR 300 METRES EACH SIDE OF OROTU DRIVE.

IF THE COUNCIL ARE CAPABLE OF PROVIDING 195 CAR PARKS ON SITE, THEN SURELY A FURTHER 100 PARKING SPACES ON SITE WOULD NOT BE BEYOND THEIR CAPABILITIES

IN RELATION TO THE DISTANCES STATED IN THE PLAN CHANGE, 600 METRES GOES FROM THE WESTMINSTER / OKOTU INTERSECTION TO THE OROTU / PACIFIC INTERSECTION AND ALLOWS 6 METRES PER PARKING SPACE.

THIS RAISES THE QUESTION AS TO WHAT THE NAPIER CITY COUNCIL INTENDS TO IMPLEMENT TO STOP VEHICLES PARKING ON THE RESIDENTIAL SIDE OF OROTU DRIVE AND FOR THAT MATTER TASMAN DRIVE.

IN RELATION TO THEIR OPTION 2 (300 METRES) EACH SIDE OF OROTU DRIVE.

FROM THIS STATEMENT ONE WOULD PRESUME THIS TO ALLOW 50 PARKING SPACES ON EITHER SIDE OF OROTU DRIVE.

ON THE RESIDENTIAL SIDE OF OROTU DRIVE THIS IS NOT POSSIBLE WITHIN THE 300 METRES STATED.

TO ACCOMMODATE 50 VEHICLES THE DISTANCE REQUIRED ON THIS SIDE OF THE ROAD WOULD NEED TO BE 600 METRES, TAKING INTO ACCOUNT RESIDENTIAL DRIVEWAYS.

THIS NOW CREATES A FURTHER PROBLEM WITH PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC ALSO OROTU DRIVE RESIDENTS WOULD NEED TO BE EXTREMELY VIGILANT IN EXITING THEIR PROPERTIES, CONTENDING WITH VEHICLES TRAVELLING DOWN OROTU DRIVE AND PEDESTRIANS AT THE SAME TIME.

AN ACCIDENT WAITING TO HAPPEN.


THE RESIDENTS WHO ARE IMMEDIATELY AFFECTED BY THE COUNCIL'S PROPOSAL REQUEST THAT SERIOUS CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN TO PROVIDE A FURTHER 100 VEHICLE SPACES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PARK ISLAND CONFIGURATION, OR CREATE AN ALTERNATIVE ENTRY TO THE COMPLEX VIA CLYDE JEFFERY DRIVE.

THE COUNCIL ARE NOW ESTIMATING 300 ADDITIONAL
VEHICLES IN THE VICINITY OF OLOU DRIVE /
TASMAN DRIVE WHICH IS 600 MOVEMENTS.

THIS IS TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE TO THE
RESIDENTS IMMEDIATELY AFFECTED BY THIS
CHANGE.

AS STATED PREVIOUSLY AN ALTERNATIVE ACCESS
SHOULD BE CREATED VIA CLYDE JEFFERT DRIVE.

THANKING YOU



N. B. MACNEIL



**SUBMISSION BY POWERCO LIMITED ON NAPIER CITY COUNCIL PLAN
CHANGE 11- PARK ISLAND RECONFIGURATION**

To: Team Leader Policy and Planning
Napier City Council
Private Bag 6010
Napier 4142
districtplan@napier.govt.nz

From: Powerco Limited ("Powerco")
Private Bag 2061
New Plymouth
(Note that this is not the address for service.)

Feedback on Plan Change 11 closes on 9th February, 2018

1. This is a submission by Powerco Limited on the Plan Change 11 (Park Island Reconfiguration).
2. The reasons for Powerco's submission are set out in the attached schedule (Schedule 1). In summary, Powerco is neutral to this plan change but this submission seeks to ensure recognition, protection and continued access to existing assets within the Plan Change 11 area and that an adequate and secure supply of gas can be supplied to any new development.
3. Powerco **does not wish to be heard** in support of this submission.
4. If others make a similar submission, Powerco would consider presenting a joint case at any hearing.

Dated at New Plymouth this 9th day of February 2018

Signature of person authorised to sign on behalf of Powerco Limited:



Simon Roche

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE:

Powerco: Private Bag 2065

New Plymouth 4340

Attention: Simon Roche

Phone: 64 06 9681779

Email: simon.roche@powerco.co.nz

Ref: SUB/2017/63

Schedule 1 – Submission by Powerco

SCHEDULE 1

REASON FOR POWERCO'S SUBMISSION

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This submission has been prepared on behalf of Powerco Limited (*Powerco*). Powerco is New Zealand's largest electricity and second largest gas distributor in terms of network length, and has been involved in energy distribution in New Zealand for more than a century. The Powerco network spreads across the upper and lower central North Island servicing over 400,000 consumers. This represents 46% of the gas connections and 16% of the electricity connections in New Zealand.
- 1.2 Powerco's gas distribution networks are split into five regions – Manawatu, Taranaki, Wellington, Hutt Valley/ Porirua and Hawkes Bay. Powerco distributes gas to residential and commercial customers in the Napier area. Within the Plan Change 11 area Powerco has underground pipes in the street, as illustrated on the map in Appendix A, along with above ground gas metering systems, within private property.

2. POWERCO'S SUBMISSION

- 2.1 Napier City Council notified Plan Change 11 to give effect to the redesigned Park Island Master Plan dated May 2017. The redesign of the Northern Sports Hub requires a reconfiguration of Residential and Sports Park zonings in the vicinity of Park Island. The proposal will result in new areas of residential lots.
- 2.2 Powerco is neutral to the proposed Plan Change but seeks to ensure that it does not result in unreasonable constraints being placed on its established gas assets, including its below ground distribution networks. It is important that any new buildings, planting ground cover or excavations recognise the presence of existing Powerco assets and provides for the development, operation, maintenance and upgrading of such assets. As such, Powerco seeks to ensure that the Council takes the following matters into account when considering this plan change.

Recognition of Powerco Gas Assets/ Future Development

- 2.3 As noted above, Powerco's has existing live gas pipes in the streets of the Plan Change 11 area, as shown in Appendix A. Powerco seeks to ensure that it has the ability to

continue to operate and maintain our gas pipes and ensure continuity of supply. To enable this to happen, damage to our pipes or inappropriate development within close proximity, that restricts Powerco's access, should be avoided. As such, Powerco seeks to be involved in early consultation in relation to future development of the area. This will enable the early identification and resolution of any potential effects on Powerco infrastructure.

- 2.4 Should any work be proposed near our pipes then the 'Dial Before You Dig' service, should be used. This can be found online at www.beforeudig.co.nz and provides information on the location of underground services, so that such services can be identified before works commence.
- 2.5 Any new buildings, structures or concrete surfaces must be set back a minimum of two metres from existing underground gas pipes.

Ensuring adequate supply of gas to new developments

The New Zealand Energy Strategy (NZES) (2011-2021)

- 2.6 The NZES provides a vision of New Zealand's energy future and has a core focus of moving towards a low emission energy system. The vision is for a reliable and resilient system delivering New Zealand sustainable, low emissions energy services, through:
- Providing clear direction on the future of New Zealand's energy system
 - Utilising markets and focused regulation to securely deliver energy services at competitive prices
 - Reducing greenhouse gas emissions, including through an emissions trading scheme
 - Maximising the contribution of cost-effective energy efficiency and conservation of energy
 - Maximising the contribution of cost-effective renewable energy resources while safeguarding our environment
 - Promoting early addition of environmentally sustainable energy technologies
 - Supporting consumers through the transition.

The New Zealand Energy Strategy 2011-2021 sets out four priority areas:

- Diverse resource development
- Environmental responsibility
- Efficient use of energy; and
- Secure and affordable energy.

Powerco supports the overall vision of the NZES, while recognising that the transition to a more sustainable energy system will involve trade-offs and compromises. The NZES recognises that gas has a significant role to play in this transition as it produces fewer emissions than other fossil fuels and will provide increased diversity and flexibility of supply. Powerco seeks to ensure that Plan Change 11 gives effect to this National Policy Statement.

National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity

2.7 I would also refer you to the objectives and policies of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity, relating to “other infrastructure”, which includes gas:

OD1. Urban environments where land use, development, development infrastructure and other infrastructure are integrated with each other.

PA2: Local authorities shall satisfy themselves that other infrastructure required to support urban development are likely to be available.

PA3: When making planning decisions that affect the way and the rate at which development capacity is provided, decision-makers shall provide for the social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing of people and communities and future generations, whilst having particular regard to:

b) Promoting the efficient use of urban land and development infrastructure and other infrastructure;

Powerco seeks to ensure that Plan Change 11 gives effect to this National Policy Statement.


2.8 Powerco are aware of the proposed growth that may occur as part of Plan Change 11. The existing gas network is expected to become constrained in the next few years and

we are planning a pressure increase on this network to provide adequate supply as the growth occurs. Additional reinforcements required to support this growth would be in the form of a further gas pressure increase and replacing trunk mains with larger diameter pipes or new network interconnection(s). For the potential new sites or increased density that may be created, it is necessary for Powerco to have some forewarning to plan for the laying of new pipes and establishment of locations for utility street furniture/above-ground assets. It is therefore best if any new infrastructure provision can occur simultaneously with the new development to minimise disruption to other infrastructure (e.g. particularly having to dig up roads) and also reduce costs to end consumers. Furthermore, the earlier this is addressed the more readily such facilities can be accommodated within the overall design of an area.

3. CONCLUDING COMMENT

- 3.1 Powerco appreciates the opportunity to input on Plan Change 11. As detailed above, Powerco has existing assets within the streets of the Plan Change 11 area and seeks to ensure that they are able to continue to operate, maintain, upgrade and access these assets. The identification of future residential growth areas shows potential future service provision. To enable a more orderly and timely provision of gas supply, Powerco should be contacted to facilitate the provision of services in concert with development.
- 3.2 Should you wish to discuss any proposals for works in close proximity to Powerco's gas pipelines, please contact Powerco's customer service team on ph: 0508 427 428 or by email: info@thegashub.co.nz.
- 3.3 Powerco would be pleased to discuss any of the matters raised above, and comment on any documents produced as a result of this consultation. If you have any queries or require additional information please do not hesitate to contact Simon Roche (06) 9681779.

Appendix A: Map of gas assets in the Plan Change 11 area





Powerco Limited
35 Junction Street
Private Bag 2065
New Plymouth 4342

☎ 0800 769 372

🌐 powerco.co.nz

9 February 2018

Terms of use for GIS data

Validity Period for licence: 3 months from date of issue

What this licence is for: The data being provided is a subset of a digital Geographical Information System (GIS) dataset. The dataset portrays gas or electricity networks, installations, plant, devices or equipment owned by Powerco Limited.

This information is for design purposes only. By using the data provided, you accept and agree to be bound by the terms of this licence.

TERMS OF THIS LICENCE

1. The data being provided:

- should be treated as a **guide only** of the **approximate location** of Powerco's assets
- may not show all of Powerco's assets (for example, recently installed, relocated or redundant assets)
- shows indicative measurements only (if any)
- is valid for the Validity Period only
- if the data is supplied through the live portal then the data is refreshed weekly
- is owned by Powerco Limited

2. Powerco does not:

- warrant the accuracy or completeness of the data
- accept any liability for any loss or damage that may arise in connection with the use of the data

Powerco can:

- terminate this licence immediately if it discovers a breach of these terms. If this happens you must delete all copies of the data

3. You must not:

- amend or modify the data
- redistribute the data to a third party
- use the data for any unlawful purpose
- allow the data to be indexed by any public internet web search engine

You must:

- ensure that Powerco Limited is acknowledged as the source of the data if copies are made

From: NCC Website Request - District Plan Submission
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Napier City Council - District Plan Submission [#25]
Date: Friday, 9 February 2018 11:27:38

Plan Change: *	11
Are you submitting on behalf of an organisation? *	Yes
Name: *	John McGifford
Organisation *	Central Football
Postal Address: *	<input type="checkbox"/> PO Box 3262 Napier, State/Province 4142 New Zealand
Phone (daytime): *	068445850
Email Address: *	ceo@centralfootball.co.nz
I wish to speak at the hearing: *	No
If others make a similar submission, would you consider presenting a joint case: *	Yes
The specific provisions of the Plan Change(s) that my submission relates to: (give details) *	The relocation of the Northern Hub and the zoning changing required to facilitate such relocation.
My submission is: (Include support/opposition to specific parts of the plan change, if you want amendments made, and reasons for your views) *	We support the changes detailed above. We would also submit that, as the plan allows, that we can not afford any more traffic on Clyde Jeffery Drive as it is already an extremely hazardous are on days that the football and hockey parks are working, and much worsened if that happens on the same day(s). Related we would request that any plans for parking off the street in Clyde Jeffery Drive be hastened before we have a major accident to deal with, or worse – being a fatality.
I seek the following decision from Napier City Council: (Give precise details stating what amendments you wish to see made e.g. retain provision, delete it, modify it in the following way, etc.) *	Nothing further to add.
Could you gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission? *	No
I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that: a) Adversely affects the environment; and b) Does not relate to trade competition or the effect of trade competition. *	No

9th February 2018

Dean Moriarity
Team Leader Policy Planning
Napier City Council
Private Bag 6010
NAPIER 4182

Dear Mr. Moriarity

Notification of Plan Change 11 to the Operative City of Napier District Plan: Park Island Reconfiguration

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission on Plan Change 11 to the Napier District Plan. As you will be aware, we had previously provided comment on an earlier draft version of Plan Change 11 in October of 2017.

HBRC support in part the proposed Plan Change 11. We have a clear understanding of the key drivers for Plan Change 11, particularly those regarding the need to provide for demand in residential housing and enhanced sporting facilities. Our understanding is in part informed by our mutual roles as joint partners in the Heretaunga Plains Urban Development Strategy and as managers of stormwater and drainage assets in the Ahuriri Estuary catchment. However, we are not currently convinced that the rezoning and associated infrastructure planning in place is sufficiently sound.

We accept that the rezoning is not yet the time or stage for fully fledged infrastructure design effort to accommodate the needs of development within the proposed rezoned areas. However, we cautiously approach this proposal given recent events and in having regard to our fundamental responsibilities for the environment under the Resource Management Act.

Due regard to the Regional Policy Statement

It was highlighted by HBRC during pre-notification consultation that Section 5.5 of the s32 Evaluation report was lacking detail in its assessment. Whilst we appreciate that the proposed plan change is largely influenced by the RPS's policies pertaining to the built environment and the Park Island/Parklands greenfield growth area, we remain of the opinion that a fuller assessment of policies in at least the following RPS chapters was warranted:

- 3.2 The sustainable management of coastal resources
- 3.5 Effects of conflicting land use activities
- 3.9 Groundwater quantity
- 3.10 Surface water resources
- 3.12 Natural hazards
- 3.13 Maintenance and enhancement of physical infrastructure

We appreciate that additional text has been provided in the s32 report to justify why this assessment has been limited, however the argument that *'the same land use activities will essentially occur within the same overall footprint'* does not seem a well-reasoned justification to essentially cherry-pick which parts of the RPS should be considered. Following this line of thought one could argue that given there is no change in land use there ought not to be an assessment of RPS Chapter 3.1B 'Managing the Built Environment'. However we disagree. We highlight that it is the extent and robustness of the assessment which is currently lacking, rather than the conclusion itself.

Stormwater collection, treatment and disposal

Based on the information provided within the proposal it appears that stormwater runoff from development is likely to be able to be accommodated within the existing drainage network, however, there is a lack of detail around the proposed runoff, consequently until such a time that detail is provided HBRC are not in a position to provide fuller support in favour of the Plan Change.

The s32 Evaluation Report highlights in chapter 5.3.3 how stormwater is proposed to be addressed within the identified zoned areas for residential use. The document notes that *'ultimately, runoff from the proposed re-configuration will be managed in the same manner i.e. primary runoff piped to the overflow channel on the northern side of Prebensen Drive and secondary runoff conveyed to the same channel via the open swale drain along Orutu Drive with eventual discharge via the Purimu Pump Station ...'*

Upon review of the supporting information it appears that no runoff from the developed area will enter the Taipo Stream, as it is generally directed to the Purimu system. As can be seen in the image below, there is a natural overflow path from the Taipo towards the development area, which needs to be kept available if levels in the Taipo Stream are to remain as they are presently i.e. without the overflow, flood levels in the Taipo Stream would be higher. We wish to highlight that HBRC have never examined the impact of such an overflow, and it was suggested this be examined in the earlier 2012 report (by HBRC).

Proposed Development

A plan showing the draft proposed development concepts is shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Proposed Development (DRAFT)

Whilst the changes to the plan appear to be able to be accommodated within the existing framework, HBRC drainage asset managers have not been party to any analysis or design work as part of the rezoning development proposals. Consequently we cannot comment of the potential impacts on the system as a result of the cumulative impact the reconfiguration of the zones and the additional 150 homes would have on the quantity of stormwater runoff and water quality of receiving environments.

Wastewater

There is also a question around the capacity of the infrastructure to cope with the additional wastewater as a result of the potential increase in the number of homes.

Both councils are well aware of a recent overflow of contaminated stormwater into the Ahuriri Estuary. We understand NCC saw fit to discharge that contaminated stormwater because of existing network capacity issues. Given there are already capacity issues within the existing network, we would caution against allowing further development (housing, sportsgrounds and increased impermeable areas) which would exacerbate existing deficiencies with the City Council's stormwater and wastewater networks.

We trust the City Council will see fit to undertake a detailed assessment of the capability of the existing infrastructure to ensure further incidences do not occur and we would ask that these findings be shared with HBRC so that we might make an informed comment in this regard.

Water management and limits in the Ahuriri Estuary catchment area

As noted above the secondary runoff is to be piped to the Ahuriri Estuary via the Purimu pump station through the existing consent for discharge. As a joint consent holder HBRC needs to understand what implications this could have on the Estuary.

The Draft Ahuriri Masterplan 2017 states that 'The Ahuriri Estuary is a nationally significant ecological environment' and due to its importance the health of the Estuary is at the heart of the plan, bringing a multi-layered approach to improving water quality and 'focusing on at-source treatment by end-of-line systems'. We are unclear how this objective is being delivered effectively through the Plan Change.

The TANK stakeholder group are currently in the process of developing a Regional Plan Change for the Tutaekuri, Ahuriri, Ngaruroro and Karamu catchments. Urban and industrial discharges of stormwater is an issue specifically considered by the TANK stakeholder group. In addition to this the Ahuriri Estuary has been identified by the Regional Council as one of its six 'hotspots' for targeted funding in its \$1 Million kick-start clean-up fund through the Annual Plan 2017-18.

Given the significance of the Estuary both at catchment and region level, it is imperative that its improved health is at the fore of decision making.

We suggest that discussions be held with HBRC's drainage asset managers regarding the conditions of the existing subdivision consent and what requirements have been (or anticipated to be) put in place from NCC (engineering code of practice), what is required in terms of stormwater design and treatment, and what low impact design principles will be applied within the subdivision development - for example, non-zinc roofing, appropriate treatment of stormwater from car park areas and roads etc. to reduce the potential contribution of contaminants to receiving environments, including the highly valued Ahuriri Estuary. Our highly experienced team of water quality scientists can also assist informing those discussions.

Natural Hazards

Since our previous correspondence to you in October 2017, the review of the region's liquefaction risk was adopted by the HB Liquefaction Risk Review Steering Group on the 2nd November 2017. Plan Change 11 has been reviewed by the Hawke's Bay Civil Defence Emergency Management Advisor, who has made the below advisory comments:

1. Liquefaction risk: The site is classified as having high liquefaction vulnerability. There is a probability of more than 50 percent that liquefaction-induced ground damage will be; moderate to severe for 500-year shaking, and; minor to moderate (or more) for 100-year shaking. Under the MBIE "Planning and engineering guidance for potentially liquefaction prone land" dated September 2017 Section 6.10 in areas assigned a liquefaction

category of high, it is recommended that a geotechnical engineer should provide input into the design of all buildings. This should include a site specific assessment of liquefaction issues, including assessment of new or existing subsurface ground investigations.

2. Tsunami inundation risk: The Hawke's Bay joint hazard strategy for local authority land-use planning (adopted by the HBCDEM Joint Committee) recommends provisions that support minimising risk to human lives including restricting location of critical facilities within these areas, and design, enhancement and protection of evacuation routes taken into account during new development such as roading infrastructure.

I would refer you to the Natural Hazards Property Report on the HB Hazard Portal should you require further information <https://hbhazards.intramaps.co.nz/IntraMaps/MapControls/HBHazards/NHDB/>

Closing comment

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission on Plan Change 11. The Regional Council does wish to be heard in support of this submission, but do not wish to present a joint case with other submitters.


Regional Council representatives would welcome further discussion with Napier City Council to continue better alignment of our relative positions on land use and water management in the Ahuriri catchment, particularly those raised in our submission above.

The Regional Council's address for service in relation to this submission is:

Hawke's Bay Regional Council
159 Dalton Street
Private Bag 6006
Napier 4110
Attention: Ceri Edmonds
Phone: 06 835 2952
Email: ceri.edmonds@hbrc.govt.nz

Should you have any queries with regards to the content of this submission please do not hesitate to contact Ceri Edmonds, as above.

Yours sincerely



TOM SKERMAN
GROUP MANAGER STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT
Phone: (06) 833 5649
Email: tom@hbrc.govt.nz

From: NCC Website Request - District Plan Submission
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Napier City Council - District Plan Submission [#24]
Date: Thursday, 8 February 2018 08:40:25

Plan Change: *	Plan change 11
Are you submitting on behalf of an organisation? *	Yes
Name: *	Cathy Sherwood
Organisation *	Launch Active Early Learning
Postal Address: *	<input type="checkbox"/> 1305 Pakowhai Road Hastings 4122 New Zealand
Phone (daytime): *	021 771 064
Email Address: *	cathy@launchael.co.nz
I wish to speak at the hearing: *	Yes
If others make a similar submission, would you consider presenting a joint case: *	No
The specific provisions of the Plan Change(s) that my submission relates to: (give details) *	Please refer to supporting letter attached
My submission is: (Include support/opposition to specific parts of the plan change, if you want amendments made, and reasons for your views) *	Please refer to supporting letter attached
I seek the following decision from Napier City Council: (Give precise details stating what amendments you wish to see made e.g. retain provision, delete it, modify it in the following way, etc.) *	Please refer to supporting letter attached
Could you gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission? *	No
I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that: a) Adversely affects the environment; and b) Does not relate to trade competition or the effect of trade competition. *	No

Launch Active Early Learning
1305 Pakowhai Road
Hastings

7th February 2018

Dean Moriarity
Team Leader Policy Planning
Napier City Council

Dear Mr Moriarty,

Plan Change 11 - Submission for Early Childhood Centre within Parklands Estate

We support the Plan Change but believe provision should be made for an Early Childhood Education Centre to be included in the Parklands Estate Development.

We successfully completed the development of Launch in 2016 which is located at 1305 Pakowhai Road, Hastings. We have a strong history of developing, establishing and managing high quality centres which provide a positive and supportive environment for all involved; children, staff, families and the community. We strongly believe we can provide a centre within Parklands Estate which will positively benefit the local residence.

I, Cathy Sherwood, have been in the ECE industry for 18 years, 6 years as a teacher and 12 years in various management and consultancy roles. I have established and managed 6 successful early childhood centres in Hawke's Bay and Auckland and have supported a number of ECE centres to increase and maintain quality outcomes for children and develop effective teaching teams.

Claire Rolls has been in the Early Childhood industry for 22 years, 13 of those as an Early Childhood teacher and 9 years in a management role. She holds a Bachelor of Education, ECE and is a Registered Teacher. Her skill set and experience is based around building learning communities, organisational culture, building successful teams with technical skills and best practice within the ECE industry.

We jointly own and manage Launch Active Early Learning which is located on Pakowhai Road in Hastings. We encourage you to visit our website www.launchael.co.nz to learn a little more about us and our philosophy.

After developing Launch we have seen the benefits it has had on the surrounding community. Parklands Estate caters for a similar community and is in an excellent position

to benefit in the same way. The early years of parenting can, at times, be over-whelming and stressful for first time and young families. Launch is a place that encourages and supports families to form relationships with each other through family gatherings and parent evenings so they don't feel isolated and like they are doing it on their own.

We employ qualified and experienced teachers who also work closely with families and offer extra support as necessary. In partnership with parents, the skills and experience of specialist agencies are also sourced to ensure our families receive the support they need so our most vulnerable can thrive.

We are passionate about the care we bring to our community and the positive outcomes we have achieved. Feedback reiterates the need for our philosophy to be extended.

To develop an ECE centre we would require between 1600 and 2000m², with a building footprint of between 400 and 500m², ideally positioned near a main entrance way or along a main arterial route. This will enable residents to drop off their children on the way into the city and pick them up when returning home. This will also allow for residents in surrounding areas to access the centre without increasing traffic.

As Launch is not a franchise, we are able to be very flexible with the design, and willing to work with NCC to come up with a design which best suits the community and surrounding homes.

Claire and I are currently developing an ECE centre within the Christchurch CBD as Christchurch City Council has identified a need for this type of service. It is located next to a sports hub, Christchurch Metro Sports Centre, and we are very excited about being able to utilise the sports facilities with our children and families.

In the early development stages we had some barriers but the Christchurch City Council worked with us to overcome these. To ensure we had a large playground to support our philosophy (above Ministry of Education minimum requirement) the CCC has amended the rules around car parking requirements for us and future developments, and are also placing a footpath between us and the sports centre car park so parents can utilise this car park when dropping off and picking up their children.

If provisions were in place for an ECE service in the initial planning stages within Parklands Estate, a suitably sized area could be earmarked to ensure space for a single level building, large playground, correct car parking configuration and large amounts of landscaping and green space. The barriers experienced with CCC would not be an issue.

The current environment in this location warrants this type of facility for the following reasons:

- Growing population;
- Demographics – support for young working families;
- Currently no early childhood centres within this area;
- Purpose built facility to support the modern community already being developed;
and
- A support hub for young busy families.

We invite you to visit Launch to get a better idea of what the Centre provides and to discuss our vision further.

Yours sincerely,

Cathy Sherwood and Claire Rolls
Launch Active Early Learning



Further Submission Form DISTRICT PLAN

PLAN CHANGE 11: Park Island Reconfiguration

Form 6, Clause 8 of the first schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

Office use only:	
Submission number:	
Date Received:	
Database:	
Date Entered:	Initials:

IMPORTANT NOTES FOR SUBMITTERS

Submissions Close: 12pm, Thursday 26 April 2018

Submissions can be from an individual or on behalf of an organisation. You may either use this form or prepare your own submission being careful to use the same format.

Submission can be made:

Online: www.napier.govt.nz
#planchange11

Email: districtplan@napier.govt.nz

Post: Team Leader Policy Planner
Napier City Council
Private Bag 6010, Napier 4142

Section 1: Applicant Details

Name of Organisation:

Contact Name:

Email:

Address for Service:

Contact no:

Postcode:

Section 2: Declaration

I am (state whether you are...)

- a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest. In this case, also specify the grounds for saying that you come within this category; or
Please specify:
- a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has. In this case, also explain the grounds for saying that you come within this category; or
Please specify:
- the local authority for the relevant area.

Section 3: Submission Details

Number of pages attached to this submission:

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?

Yes No

If others make a similar submission, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case?

Yes No

Signature:

Date:

Section 4: Your Submission

I support (or oppose) the submission of:

Name and address of original submitter and submission number of original submission if available:

The particular parts of the submission I support (or oppose) are:

Clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal:

The reasons for my support (or opposition) are:

Give reason:

I seek that the whole (or part [describe part]) of the submission be allowed (or disallowed):

Give precise details:

Important information:

1. The council must receive this submission before the closing date and time for further submissions on this Plan Change or Variation
2. Please note that submissions are public. Your name and submission will be included in papers that are available to the media and the public. Your submission will only be used for the purpose of the Plan Change or Variation process.
3. Only those submitters who indicate they wish to speak at the hearing will be sent a copy of the planning report. A link to the report will be provided to all submitters.