
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: 12/12/2023

Submission Reference Number #:267

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

Submitter:

Sarah Groom

Address for service:

Sarah Groom
47 Clarence Cox Crescent Pirimai Napier 4112
New Zealand

Email: sarahgroom94@gmail.com

Attachments:

Sarah Groom.pdf

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

- **Yes**

Submission points

Point 267.1

Section: MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Sub-section: Policies

Provision:

MRZ-P7: Sustainable design and infrastructure

Ensure potential public health, environmental health, and flooding effects of development are minimised, including by:

- a. restricting the maximum impervious area on a site in order to manage the amount of stormwater run-off generated by a development and ensure that adverse effects on water quality, quantity, and amenity values are avoided or mitigated;
- b. encouraging water-sensitive design where practicable;
- c. encouraging sustainable design in development including optimising solar orientation and passive ventilation, and
- d. ensuring sufficient infrastructure provision and/or mitigation measures to meet demand.

Relates to MRZ-O5

Sentiment: Oppose

Submission:

I oppose the proposed zoning of the Medium Density Residential Zone and the Standards Table that outlines the criteria for Medium Density development. The introduction of this greatly intensified development will adversely impact the nature of our neighbourhoods and suburbs.

The proposed MDZ maximum height and height in relation to boundary is too imposing on the existing character of our suburbs.

The proposed

MDZ rules means that these new developments will be overlooking peoples private yards, blocking the sun/daylight and aspect that we currently

enjoy and actively sought when choosing to live in the suburbs.

The Medium Density Zone needs to be reconsidered. It is proposed to intensify areas such as Pirimai - known flood zones - without any proposal

to upgrade the existing stormwater network. We are no longer able to move insurance company. When we tried to, we were told by other

insurance companies that due to information NCC has provided these insurers about flooding in our area, we are now a red-list property (along

with the majority of our street/area) that cannot and will not be insured by the likes of Tower due to flooding.

We are now stuck with our current insurance provider, paying massively increased premiums and flood excesses due to living in a 1:50 year floor

zone despite the fact our house did not flood in November 2020 or February/March of 2023. NCC is proposing medium density development in

our area with an allowable 80% impervious area and no requirement for stormwater retention or detention. This increased development and

subsequent impervious area, would only intensify stormwater runoff, contributing further to flooding in our area.

What will this mean for new developments in our area? Are new homes built in this area going to be unable to take out an insurance policy?

I understand the need to increase our housing stock, but Napier City Council should be amending the district plan to make it easier for people to

subdivide their larger sections in the suburbs. This helps to retain the existing character in the neighbourhood, where often the front section has the

existing house and a new single-storey house can be built on the rear. People are less opposed to this development in the neighbourhoods,

particularly in the suburbs, where we have purposely chosen to live (buy, rent or build) so that we can have a yard, privacy and aspect where we

can enjoy being outside while maintaining privacy from surrounding properties.

NCC have not made the proposed district plan easy to navigate for lay people. It is difficult to access and understand by those who are unfamiliar

with the format. The maps distributed by post were not clear for people to understand where their property lies in the proposal and what the proposed real-world changes will mean for them, their properties and their neighbourhoods.

Relief sought

NCC need to reduce the maximum height of the MDZ to 2 storeys maximum to allow for intensification, but not at the expense of the existing character of our neighbourhoods and the amenity of residents. The existing 45° angle for height in relation to boundary, 3m above the existing ground line needs to be maintained. Any exceptions to this need to go through the process of resource consent and give neighbours a voice.

The Medium Density Zone needs to be reconsidered to take natural hazards in each area into account. NCC needs to work with insurance companies to ensure new builds would be insured and existing homeowners are able to take out insurance policies with all insurers.

Multiple disciplines/departments across NCC need to be involved in future decision making to help determine not only the planning implications, but current building consent issues that may arise (a lot of recent changes to building code that are affecting design methodologies and construction

types), as well as discussions with services and assets teams to determine which suburbs have the services in place - waste water and stormwater

networks are able to cope with increased demand. We need to ensure suburbs have the required amenities (shops, doctors, parks/rec facilities, schools etc) to service an influx of residents, consider which suburbs have the potential to grow not only their housing numbers but have potential

areas to grow these facilities and amenities that are so fundamental to ensuring the wellbeing and quality of life that all Napier residents deserve.

Intensification needs to be in areas that have the basic public amenities and are not in areas with identified natural hazards such as being prone to

flooding, as this intensification will only compound existing stormwater issues. The foundations of strong services networks and amenities (or future

possibilities for development of these amenities) need to be implemented first.

The submission process has been difficult - having to make an account, select which areas of the plan you wish to make a submission about. Zone

specific letters needed to be sent to affected suburbs/streets/addresses for people to have been clearly able to understand which proposed zone

their property would be in and what the real world implications of this would be for them.

I would like to see NCC extend the submissions period and be more proactive in advertising the zones, clauses and tables in the proposed district

plan and what these changes might actually mean/ the real world implications for people.

Point 267.2

Section: MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

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

Provision:

MRZ-S1: Height

Purpose: to achieve an 1. Buildings and structures must not exceed 12 **Matters of discretion are:**

urban character while providing for a reasonable standard of amenity for neighbouring properties.

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.

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

3. Buildings and structure must not exceed the **Matters of discretion are:** Airport Height Control Designation in Appendix 1.

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

1. Aircraft and community safety.

Sentiment: Oppose

Submission:

The proposed MDZ maximum height and height in relation to boundary is too imposing on the existing character of our suburbs. The proposed MDZ rules means that these new developments will be overlooking peoples private yards, blocking the sun/daylight and aspect that we currently enjoy and actively sought when choosing to live in the suburbs.

Relief sought

NCC need to reduce the maximum height of the MDZ to 2 storeys maximum to allow for intensification, but not at the expense of the existing character of our neighbourhoods and the amenity of residents. The existing 45° angle for height in relation to boundary, 3m above the existing ground line needs to be maintained. Any exceptions to this need to go through the process of resource consent and give neighbours a voice.

Point 267.3

Section: MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

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

Provision:

MRZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary

Purpose: to achieve an 1. Buildings and structures must not project

Matters of discretion are:

urban character; to facilitate a range of housing forms while maintaining a reasonable level of sunlight access and minimise effects on the quality of the neighbours' living environment.

- beyond a 45 degree recession plane measured from a point 4 m vertically above ground level along side and rear boundaries.
2. Where the site abuts an entrance strip or access lot, the furthest boundary of the entrance strip or access lot may be deemed to be the site boundary for the purpose of MRZ-S2.1. above.
 3. Control MRZ-S2.1. above does not apply to a boundary adjoining:
 - a. sites exceeding 2,000 m² in an Open Space Zone or gazetted reserve, and
 - b. there is an existing common wall between two buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed.
 4. Where the site adjoins a site zoned General Residential Zone, MRZ-S2.1. and 2. do not apply and buildings must comply with GRZ-S2.
 5. MRZ-S2 clause 1 above does not apply to the height exemptions set out in MRZ-S1 clause 2.
1. Purpose of the standard;
 2. Housing supply and diversity;
 3. Planned urban character;
 4. Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces, and
 5. Quality living environments.

Sentiment: Oppose

Submission:

The proposed MDZ maximum height and height in relation to boundary is too imposing on the existing character of our suburbs. The proposed MDZ rules means that these new developments will be overlooking peoples private yards, blocking the sun/daylight and aspect that we currently enjoy and actively sought when choosing to live in the suburbs.

Relief sought

The existing 45° angle for height in relation to boundary, 3m above the existing ground line needs to be maintained. Any exceptions to this need to go through the process of resource consent and give neighbours a voice.

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 - District Planning

Date started: 13/12/2023

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

Address for service:

Sarah Groom
47 Clarence Cox Crescent Pirimai Napier 4112
New Zealand
Email: sarahgroom94@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?

-

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

-

Submission points

Point .

Section: MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Sub-section: MRZ - Medium Density Residential

Sentiment: Oppose

Submission:

I oppose the proposed zoning of the Medium Density Residential Zone and the Standards Table that outlines the criteria for Medium Density development. The introduction of this greatly intensified development will adversely impact the nature of our neighbourhoods and suburbs.

The proposed MDZ maximum height and height in relation to boundary is too imposing on the existing character of our suburbs. The proposed MDZ rules means that these new developments will be overlooking peoples private yards, blocking the sun/daylight and aspect that we currently enjoy and actively sought when choosing to live in the suburbs.

The Medium Density Zone needs to be reconsidered. It is proposed to intensify areas such as Pirimai - known flood zones - without any proposal to upgrade the existing stormwater network. We are no longer able to move insurance company. When we tried to, we were told by other insurance companies that due to information NCC has provided these insurers about flooding in our area, we are now a red-list property (along with the majority of our street/area) that cannot and will not be insured by the likes of Tower due to flooding.

We are now stuck with our current insurance provider, paying massively increased premiums and flood excesses due to living in a 1:50 year floor zone despite the fact our house did not flood in November 2020 or February/March of 2023. NCC is proposing medium density development in our area with an allowable 80% impervious area and no requirement for stormwater retention or detention. This increased development and subsequent impervious area, would only intensify stormwater runoff, contributing further to flooding in our area.

What will this mean for new developments in our area? Are new homes built in this area going to be unable to take out an insurance policy?

I understand the need to increase our housing stock, but Napier City Council should be amending the district plan to make it easier for people to subdivide their larger sections in the suburbs. This helps to retain the existing character in the neighbourhood, where often the front section has the existing house and a new single-storey house can be built on the rear. People are less opposed to this development in the neighbourhoods, particularly in the suburbs, where we have purposely chosen to live (buy, rent or build) so that we can have a yard, privacy and aspect where we can enjoy being outside while maintaining privacy from surrounding properties.

NCC have not made the proposed district plan easy to navigate for lay people. It is difficult to access and understand by those who are unfamiliar with the format. The maps distributed by post were not clear for people to understand where their property lies in the proposal and what the proposed real-world changes will mean for them, their properties and their neighbourhoods.

Relief sought

NCC need to reduce the maximum height of the MDZ to 2 storeys maximum to allow for intensification, but not at the expense of the existing character of our neighbourhoods and the amenity of residents. The existing 45° angle for height in relation to boundary, 3m above the existing ground line needs to be maintained. Any exceptions to this need to go through the process of resource consent and give neighbours a voice.

The Medium Density Zone needs to be reconsidered to take natural hazards in each area into account. NCC needs to work with insurance companies to ensure new builds would be insured and existing homeowners are able to take out insurance policies with all insurers.

Multiple disciplines/departments across NCC need to be involved in future decision making to help determine not only the planning implications, but current building consent issues that may arise (a lot of recent changes to building code that are affecting design methodologies and construction types), as well as discussions with services and assets teams to determine which suburbs have the services in place - waste water and stormwater networks are able to cope with increased demand. We need to ensure suburbs have the required amenities (shops, doctors, parks/rec facilities, schools etc) to service an influx of residents, consider which suburbs have the potential to grow not only their housing numbers but have potential areas to grow these facilities and amenities that are so fundamental to ensuring the wellbeing and quality of life that all Napier residents deserve.

Intensification needs to be in areas that have the basic public amenities and are not in areas with identified natural hazards such as being prone to flooding, as this intensification will only compound existing stormwater issues. The foundations of strong services networks and amenities (or future possibilities for development of these amenities) need to be implemented first.

The submission process has been difficult - having to make an account, select which areas of the plan you wish to make a submission about. Zone specific letters needed to be sent to affected suburbs/streets/addresses for people to have been clearly able to understand which proposed zone their property would be in and what the real world implications of this would be for them.

I would like to see NCC extend the submissions period and be more proactive in advertising the zones, clauses and tables in the proposed district plan and what these changes might actually mean/ the real world implications for people.