
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 #:211

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 211.1

Section: TPT - Transport

Sub-section: Policies

Provision:

TPT-P1: Roads and connections

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. where practicable provide for different modes of land transport;
- c. supports growth, and
- d. contributes to the health, safety, and wellbeing of the community.

Relates to TPT-O1

Sentiment: Oppose

Submission:

It appears that motor cars will not be incorporated as a part of the future in Napier...and other councils as this is a nationwide(global) initiative we are currently facing.

Based on scientific data it is evident that NZ only contributes .09% co2 globally is this so large that cars have to be removed? Carbon is an absolutely necessary element to plant organisms. and we are currently experiencing a slight increase in this amount to bring us out of a severe shortage of the element globally. With such draconian policy being implemented we are in more threat from central govt over this than climate change. This is verifiable.

Removal of all minimum car parking requirements is thus unnecessary. Making walking cycling and public transport the priority is not going to allow the elderly and dissabled and children going to school to get around well.

Adding to this is the increase in bicycle parking and showering facilities for cyclists only! What will this lead rate payers to have to pay? This is quite controlling and herding like, to be implemented into the cities infrastructure. Those unable to use this will still pay for them or are there such provisions for user pays?

Landscaping roads will reduce the ability for people to travel in cars and already this has been effected to some extent where traffic builds up preventing flow. Some towns have bollards in place and also planter boxes for the purpose of restricting motorised private and commercial transport. Emergency access will be impaired and children will end up on the streets instead of where it is really safe on a private property. Children and bicycles is not a really good combination when it is the only place for these activities.

Smart technologies will be regulated by policy on innovation in movement. This could mean we have more of a move to AI something we are being warned about as being extremely dangerous. Add in security surveillance cameras which have the potential to remove everyones privacy (facial recognition cameras are possible now after all). the loss of more freedoms and increase in control and surveillance are a side thing to the advantages of this. It means also that cars are to be replaced and 5 G rolled out more to run our lives..Not something that humans interact physiologically well with or need actually in their day to day activities. We all got on fine when all we had was copper cable telephone lines and no internet as a point for a reality check. A Governement has no ability to advise of the negative aspects of their changes when it is all new and unexplored and so can't make changes based on care of the people they are elected to serve.

Loss of private, quiet culdesac streets and gated communities are in order which again remove more benefits to people. The emergency access aspect to this is not a problem We have lived very well with this for decades.

There has not been any dramatic changes in the past for hazard events ..why now?

The district plan says it "encourages and enables where practicable". This does not encourage humans living well and benefiting from it It is a globally recognized plan that restricts people and controls them.

The two plans Transport and dwellings work together because they are designed as a whole but this should not be so organised.as it is controlling.The UN has asked for countries to be working towards Agenda 2030 which is where all of this comes from ultimately i believe. it is seriously flawed and obfuscates the real intention.

If the people object to this plan criteria they will be voting differently next time.

Relief sought

As above ,see all there is to learn about what climate does naturally and how it is not necessarily due to mans influence. we musn`t be subjected to draconian rules and we only can allow it if we are not aware.

Cars are not the problem they are necessary we need to redesign this plan to accomodate cars. Public transport should exist but be a choice over whether we use it.

Cycling should be a choice. walking should be a choice. using a car should be a choice.

Car parks need to be designed into any dwelling plan. Population trends demographically needs to be questioned.

To do nothing in changing the status quo is the best option regarding cars and parking at an initial stage and later more debate on the crucial questions should follow.

It is up to the people to voice their concerns and solutions to such proposals,and the Govt`s responsibility to listen.

I for one have begun to educate myself on what is happening but until this started i would have had no reference or opinion with which to base an argument on. I feel the majority of Napier residents do not understand the implications of these plans. It would be lawfull and legal to make any contractual agreement with residents so that this is completely understood and agreed with consent, otherwise it is an agreemant (contract) that is null and void by law.