
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: 14/12/2023

Submission Reference Number #:159

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

Submitter:

Marisa Mous

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

- **No**

Submission points

Point 159.1

Section: MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

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

Provision:

MRZ-S1: Height

Purpose: *to achieve an urban character while providing for a reasonable standard of amenity for neighbouring properties.*

1. Buildings and structures must not exceed 12 m in height.
2. The following are excluded from complying with MRZ-S1 clause 1:
 - a. solar heating devices;
 - b. air conditioning units and similar structures housing mechanical and/or;
 - c. electronic equipment, and
 - d. one chimney per building.

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.

where the device, unit, or other structure does not exceed the maximum height of clause 1 by more than 2.5 m vertically and 1.0 m in any horizontal direction.

Airport Height Control

Purpose: *to maintain the safety of aircraft approaching and taking off from Hawkes Bay airport.*

3. Buildings and structure must not exceed the Airport Height Control Designation in Appendix 1.

Matters of discretion are:

1. Aircraft and community safety.

Sentiment: Oppose

Submission:

The new height, along with closer spaced buildings, would allow developers to buy properties, clear the property and erect building that would be closer and higher than what was removed from the property without the neighbours being allowed to oppose. This would affect the neighbours quiet enjoyment of their property - the higher, closer building would affect the current buildings outlook and sunlight. Not requiring off street parking will also cause problems - the streets are too narrow for multiple cars to park on both sides of the streets. Medium and high density zones being around public transport routes is not going to change how most people have at least 1 car (and the public transport is absolutely rubbish and the population base isn't big enough to create a decent public transport system such as those overseas).

It's also noted that the proposed medium and high density zones are in the poorer areas and it has been in Stuff how Napier City Council will back down when undesirable housing proposals are made for more affluent areas as they will get lawyers involved which poorer areas are unable to do.

Relief sought

Do not create the high and medium density zones as it will lower the quiet enjoyment allowed in national legislation for the existing properties.

Point 159.2

Section: GRZ - General Residential Zone

Sub-section: GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table

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

Purpose: *to provide for privacy of residential units while enabling opportunities for passive surveillance of the street and public open spaces; 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 within a side or rear yard adjacent to 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 length of the boundary 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. Neighbourhood character;
3. Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces, and
4. Quality living environments.

Sentiment: Oppose

Submission:

The proposed 1.2m height (or visibility of 50% for a higher fence but only for 50% of the boundary) for boundary fences between properties would make people significantly less safe. 1.2m is chest height for a woman. The current height should be maintained to allow quiet enjoyment of our own property/rental property.

I have lived at properties where the neighbours were extremely interested at being able to see into my property and watch me, with a fence that was higher than 1.2m. Having it enabled that people can easily watch their neighbours (and in fact it would be nearly impossible not to watch neighbours) would cause issues between neighbours, not make it more likely that people will get to know their neighbours. People do not like being watched or having their children watched. I have higher boundary fences but know my neighbours, this is because the neighbours and I want to know each other.

The proposed height is also extremely easy for dogs to jump. I have lived at more than one property where the neighbours dog is extremely aggressive towards me (trying to get over the head height fence to attack, having to cross the road if we are both walking our dogs) and hostile when I have tried speaking to the owner. At 1.2m the dog would be able to jump the fence putting myself and my pets at risk. Having a high solid fence allows my neighbour to keep their pet but allows me and my animals be safe on my property.

Relief sought

Keep the current fencing rules

Point 159.3

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 proposed 1.2m height (or visibility of 50% for a higher fence but only for 50% of the boundary) for boundary fences between properties would make people significantly less safe. 1.2m is chest height for a woman. The current height should be maintained.

I have lived at properties where the neighbours were extremely interested at being able to see into my property and watch me, with a fence that was higher than 1.2m. Having it enabled that people can easily watch their neighbours (and in fact it would be nearly impossible not to watch neighbours) would cause issues between neighbours, not make it more likely that people will get to know their neighbours. People do not like being watched or having their children watched. I have higher boundary fences but know my neighbours, this is because the neighbours and I want to know each other.

The proposed height is also extremely easy for dogs to jump. I have lived at more than one property where the neighbours dog is extremely aggressive towards me (trying to get over the head height fence to attack, having to cross the road if we are both walking our dogs) and hostile when I have tried speaking to the owner. At 1.2m the dog would be able to jump the fence putting myself and my pets at risk. Having a high solid fence allows my neighbour to keep their pet but allows me and my animals be safe on my property.

Relief sought

Keep the existing fence heights for safety of the community