

---

## Submission on Napier City Proposed District Plan

### Form 5 Submission on publically notified proposal for policy statement or plan, change or variation

*Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991*

**To:** Napier City Council - Planning Unit

**Date received:** 17/10/2023

**Submission Reference Number #:**13

This is a submission on the following proposed plan (the **proposal**): Napier City Proposed District Plan

**Submitter:**

Denise Ockey

**Address for service:**

Denise Ockey  
6 Cormack Place Greenmeadows Napier 4110  
New Zealand

**Email:** deniselucy1234@gmail.com

**I wish to be heard:** No

**I am willing to present a joint case:** No

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?

- **No**

Are you 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 effects of trade competition

- **N/A**

## Submission points

---

**Point 13.1**

**Section:** MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

**Sub-section:** MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone - Standards Table

**Provision:****MRZ-S8: Fences and walls**

**Purpose:** *to provide for privacy of residential units while enabling opportunities for passive surveillance of the street; to minimise visual dominance effects to immediate neighbours and the street.*

1. Fences or walls (or a combination of these structures) must not exceed the height specified below, measured from the ground level at the boundary:
  - a. within the front yard, and along a common boundary with an Open Space Zone, either:
    - i. 1.2 m in height;
    - ii. 1.8 m in height for no more than 50% of the site frontage and 1.2 m for the remainder, or
    - iii. 1.8 m in height if the fence is at least 50% visually open as viewed perpendicular to the front boundary.
  - b. Within the side and rear yards: 2 m.

**Matters of discretion are:**

1. Purpose of the standard;
2. Planned urban character;
3. Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces, and
4. Quality living environments.

**Sentiment:** Oppose

**Submission:**

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.

**Relief sought**

Requiring fences of 1.8m high to have 25% of the fence to have open visibility.