

---

## 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:** 15/12/2023

**Submission Reference Number #:**206

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

**Submitter:**

warren pearce

**Address for service:**

warren pearce  
431 Gloucester st Taradale \* 4112  
New Zealand

**Email:** wpfreeman@protonmail.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

- No

## Submission points

---

**Point 206.1**

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

**Sub-section:** Policies

**Provision:****MRZ-P5: Urban character**

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, and
- c. requiring setbacks and landscaped areas that are consistent with an urban character.

*Relates to MRZ-O4*

**Sentiment:** Oppose

**Submission:**

Since the new coalition Govt has started, they have stated they will make the district plans for local councils optional. This should come down to a referendum or vote. Or vote for the councilors that represents our best interests.

Medium density (and High density) will lead certain areas to become slums. Children will have nowhere to play and experience the outside world.

This could lead to more screen time adversely affecting their development. for instance. A minimum rule of 20 sq m for ground stories and 6 sqm for other two stories is a very low value for having somewhere to play or experience outdoor. Many properties are already small so this may become a norm for new developments.

People will not be able to have gardens to grow their own food. Even if they could in some small corner of land the shading effect would be large. How would people be able to divvy up the limited space for three families/households? This would potentially also shade neighbours.

Mental health will suffer for residents of such dwellings..Noise will interfere with their private lives and potentially extend throughout the night.Many people can't sleep well at the best of times .Stress increases.. This effect leads to less of what human beings really need.

Earthquakes could topple or affect the stability of such buildings, making them more dangerous or expensive to build

Car parking at no minimum value could mean to prevent the use of cars in the future and drive people into a world where they cannot move freely.(15 minute city idea and no good way to travel further). People with disabilities may not be able get where they need to go. Also children being driven to schools where will the car be parked (unless developers make provisions for garage and /or street parking., Older people may be left out in terms of staying in contact with family friends and doing shopping. Public transport is inefficient with small populations such as Napier's

The traffic plan seems to fit with this plan whereby we are being herded into not having personal car transport. Cycling and walking should be optional not forced. What are the facts council uses to determine that use of cars is not still the best way forward I have seen counter arguments to the narrative about climate change.Many! The commonly known narrative on climate simply makes no sense and confuses the issue at every opportunity

What is the criteria determining the need for increased residential structures of this nature? It appears that population change /increase is made up of a dropping live births rate and increasing excess deaths ....is it immigration? Who is responsible for this then?

It would seem developers would tend to go for the most value their properties project would return to them and by enlarging the size of buildings they can achieve this greater return. The plan is for the provision for such buildings but may lead to many more dwellings that affect the neighbourhood /town area.

People would not have a say over how one of these properties would impact their property.

They would lose any say on ideas to have the effect reduced.

Crime can increase in areas where slum like effects are created and where increased density allows this.

A lack of personal space is a lack of privacy. This may only be available indoors. People without the options to choose to live in such dwellings will not do well. Others of course may decide this is what they want and do well.

Surveillance will inevitably be increased and it is sad to have to be watched by cameras when we have an option not to go down this path. The future is said to be run this way especially when you read into the plans that are about to be made more real. That is there is a prediction of more surveillance than we already have unless people object in mass.

Allowing residential spread on to peripheral areas of the surrounding land within reason allows People to come first over draconian earth- first policies. If in fact population increase is inevitable increasing people's freedom has to be the answer and can lead to people making their own best decisions on living in harmony with nature bettering their education and controlling their family size. We see this as opposed to olden times where families are smaller than they once were. It should be a personal choice as it was once.

A loss of character in the neighbourhood will inevitably occur and property/ house values will change.

Infrastructure would have to be reworked. 3 waters infrastructure will cause rates to increase hugely and especially about the storm water system where soak up into the available ground will be reduced making flooding more of a problem.

Overall this plan is not valuable to us as people of the town it only suits the planners sense of need and a greater agenda that isn't talked about much. There should be transparent and outgoing efforts to show that this plan is properly rooted in science, truth and reason. Hardly anyone I know has any idea that this is happening and that big changes are on the horizon. People are busy with their lives and can't afford to spend time on working out the pros and cons of this. A public debate would have helped or a general referendum to show that we still live in a democracy. This sounds like a corporate issue. I wonder how many people realise that Central Govt and local government are in fact corporations.

I for one do not consent.

## **Relief sought**

See above as I have added into the previous section some ideas. The main idea though is that people should be given more responsibility for their lives not to be told what they are to do. This is the only real way to evolve as a community. Mostly I think it can be seen that solutions are self evident. Priorities and paradigms have to change to make some form of alternative plan.

Would it be OK /fair to ask that if this submission is deemed to be irrelevant (vexatious or annoying), that a reason would be given as to why before it is discarded by someone over zealous in their need to get this plan into action at any cost? Obviously there will be no follow up to these submissions so it would be difficult to inform people that such a thing has occurred.

---

## **Point 206.2**

**Section:** HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

**Sub-section:** Policies

**Provision:**

HRZ-P5: Urban character

Achieve the planned high-density residential built character by:

- a. Enabling buildings of generally up to six storeys;
- b. Encouraging development to provide a quality edge to the street through building orientation, setbacks, low or visually permeable fencing, and landscaping, and
- c. Providing opportunities for space around buildings and on-site landscaping.

*Relates to HRZ-04*

**Sentiment:** Oppose

**Submission:**

Since the new coalition Govt has started, they have stated they will make the district plans for local councils optional. This should come down to a referendum or vote. Or vote for the councilors that represents our best interests.

Medium density (and High density) will lead certain areas to become slums. Children will have nowhere to play and experience the outside world.

This could lead to more screen time adversely affecting their development. For instance. A minimum rule of 20 sq m for ground stories and 6 sqm for other two stories is a very low value for having somewhere to play or experience outdoor. Many properties are already small so this may become a norm for new developments.

People will not be able to have gardens to grow their own food. Even if they could in some small corner of land the shading effect would be large. How would people be able to divy up the limited space for three families/households? This would potentially also shade neighbours.

Mental health will suffer for residents of such dwellings.. Noise will interfere with their private lives and potentially extend throughout the night. Many people can't sleep well at the best of times. Stress increases.. This effect leads to less of what human beings really need.

Earthquakes could topple or affect the stability of such buildings, making them more dangerous or expensive to build

Car parking at no minimum value could mean to prevent the use of cars in the future and drive people into a world where they cannot move freely. (15 minute city idea and no good way to travel further). People with disabilities may not be able to get where they need to go. Also children being driven to schools where will the car be parked (unless developers make provisions for garage and /or street parking., Older people may be left out in terms of staying in contact with family friends and doing shopping. Public transport is inefficient with small populations such as Napier's

The traffic plan seems to fit with this plan whereby we are being herded into not having personal car transport. Cycling and walking should be optional not forced. What are the facts council uses to determine that use of cars is not still the best way forward I have seen counter arguments to the narrative about climate change. Many! The commonly known narrative on climate simply makes no sense and confuses the issue at every opportunity

What is the criteria determining the need for increased residential structures of this nature? It appears that population change /increase is made up of a dropping live births rate and increasing excess deaths ....is it immigration? Who is responsible for this then?

It would seem developers would tend to go for the most value their properties project would return to them and by enlarging the size of buildings they can achieve this greater return. The plan is for the provision for such buildings but may lead to many more dwellings that affect the neighbourhood /town area.

People would not have a say over how one of these properties would impact their property.

They would lose any say on ideas to have the effect reduced.

Crime can increase in areas where slum like effects are created and where increased density allows this.

A lack of personal space is a lack of privacy. This may only be available indoors. People without the options to choose to live in such dwellings will not do well. Others of course may decide this is what they want and do well.

Surveillance will inevitably be increased and it is sad to have to be watched by cameras when we have an option not to go down this path. The future is said to be run this way especially when you read into the plans that are about to be made more real. That is there is a prediction of more surveillance than we already have unless people object in mass.

Allowing residential spread on to peripheral areas of the surrounding land within reason allows people to come first over draconian earth-first policies. If in fact population increase is inevitable increasing people's freedom has to be the answer and can lead to people making their own best decisions on living in harmony with nature bettering their education and controlling their family size. We see this as opposed to olden times where families are smaller than they once were. It should be a personal choice as it was once.

A loss of character in the neighbourhood will inevitably occur and property/ house values will change.

Infrastructure would have to be reworked. 3 waters infrastructure will cause rates to increase hugely and especially about the storm water system where soak up into the available ground will be reduced making flooding more of a problem.

Overall this plan is not valuable to us as people of the town it only suits the planners sense of need and a greater agenda that isn't talked about much. There should be transparent and outgoing efforts to show that this plan is properly rooted in science, truth and reason. Hardly anyone I know has any idea that this is happening and that big changes are on the horizon. People are busy with their lives and can't afford to spend time on working out the pros and cons of this. A public debate would have helped or a general referendum to show that we still live in a democracy. This sounds like a corporate issue. I wonder how many people realise that Central Govt and local government are in fact corporations.

I for one do not consent.

### Relief sought

See above as I have added into the previous section some ideas. The main idea though is that people should be given more responsibility for their lives not to be told what they are to do. This is the only real way to evolve as a community. Mostly I think it can be seen that solutions are self-evident. Priorities and paradigms have to change to make some form of alternative plan.

Would it be OK/fair to ask that if this submission is deemed to be irrelevant (vexatious or annoying), that a reason would be given as to why before it is discarded by someone over zealous in their need to get this plan into action at any cost? Obviously there will be no follow up to these submissions so it would be difficult to inform people that such a thing has occurred.

---

### Point 206.3

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

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

#### Provision:

##### MRZ-S11: Outdoor living space

**Purpose:** to provide quality onsite living environments by

1. A residential unit at ground floor level must have an outdoor living space that is at least 20 m<sup>2</sup> and that comprises ground floor,

**Matters of discretion are:**

*providing useable outdoor living areas appropriate for the number of residents onsite and recognising the accessibility of public open space*

balcony, patio, or roof terrace space that:

- a. where located at ground level, has no dimension less than 3 m.
- b. where provided in the form of a balcony, patio, or roof terrace, is at least 8 m<sup>2</sup> and has a minimum dimension of 1.8 m.
- c. Is accessible from the residential unit.
- d. may be:
  - i. grouped cumulatively by area in one communally accessible location, or
  - ii. located directly adjacent to the unit.
- e. free of buildings, parking spaces, and servicing and manoeuvring areas.

1. Purpose of the standard;
2. Quality living environments, and
3. Housing supply and diversity.

2. A residential unit located above ground floor level must have an outdoor living space in the form of a balcony, patio, or roof terrace that:

- a. is at least 8 m<sup>2</sup> and has a minimum dimension of 1.8 m.
- b. is accessible from the residential unit.
- c. may be:
  - i. grouped cumulatively by area in one communally accessible location, in which case it may be located at ground level, or
  - ii. located directly adjacent to the unit.

3. Where open space is located south of any building located on the same site, the southern boundary of that space must be separate from any wall or building by:

- a. at least 9 m for two-storey buildings, and
- b. at least 6 m for single-storey buildings.

For the purpose of this standard, south is defined as between 135 and 225 degrees.

**Sentiment:** Oppose

**Submission:**

Medium density (and High density) will lead certain areas to become slums. Children will have nowhere to play and experience the outside world.

This could lead to more screen time adversely affecting their development. for instance. A minimum rule of 20

sq m for ground stories and 6 sqm for other two stories is a very low value for having somewhere to play or experience outdoor. Many properties are already small so this may become a norm for new developments.