

---

## 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:** 28/11/2023

**Submission Reference Number #:**48

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

**Submitter:**

Michael Keukelaar

**Address for service:**

Michael Keukelaar  
2 sanders ave Marewa Napier 4110  
New Zealand

**Email:** mikekinthebay@xtra.co.nz

**I wish to be heard:** Yes

**I am willing to present a joint case:** Yes

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 48.1**

**Section:** OVR3 - Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay

**Sub-section:** Objectives

**Provision:**

**OVR3-O2: Protect and maintain heritage values of the Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay**

The physical and visual qualities of the heritage values of the Marewa Post-War Historic Heritage Overlay are protected and maintained, while contributing to housing choice.

*Relates to OVR3-I1*

**Sentiment:** Oppose

**Submission:**

With reference to front boundary distances for future development and fence heights , there has been no consideration given to corner sites such as mine of 2 Sanders avenue in the Post war art deco confinement.

The original house site is situated 1.6 meters off the Sanders avenue neighbor's boundary and further development of a double garage/hobby room some 25 years ago, has been developed to 1 meter of that said boundary.

Apart from a 8.5 meter stretch of boundary coming off Herrick street to mark the South West boundary where the Garage/hobby room sits 3.2 meters off that boundary, the entirety of the other two corner site boundaries lie on Sanders avenue and Herrick street, which we assume is road frontage with regards to the NCC RMA.

To be more precise one could debate it is **NOT** a site that is the usual site as described by the NCC district plan of 3 neighboring boundaries that allow to be developed up to at 1 meter and have a fence at 2 meters high, and one front road front boundary that only permits development no closer than 7 meters to that boundary and a solid fence at 600mm or partial visibility balustrade fence of 1200mm .

It is in fact a property that has only 2 side boundaries, one of which is only 8.5meters wide and the other two boundaries are actually for all intention and purposes both road front boundaries which dictate for all intentions and purposes in this case as one very long continuous road front boundary, being a corner site boundary.

The first issue we are face with as property owners, is we are on our site unable to undertake any development unless we apply for resource consent because of the 7 meter rule to the road frontage, as explained.

We can live with that, as we are in the art deco classification, we would require resource consent to ensure our development fits into the aesthetic period look.

The main issue for us is fencing, security and privacy. Our road frontage on both streets is our front yard, back yard, side yard, it is our only yard. As explained our house was originally built back on the private boundary.

We currently have a 2 meter high wooden paling brown stained road frontage fence on Sanders avenue. This Fence continues around the corner on Herrick street to over half way down that boundary. It then becomes driveway parking and garden open to the road.

We have in 4 years had no issue with intruders within the fenced locked yard. We are private from the street noise and foot traffic. We feel safe on that side of the property.

However On the open side, we have had cars damaged, broken into, all my trade tools stolen, people randomly knocking on our door and running away late hours in the night and recycling bottles from across the road thrown and smashed on our drive way.

Above and beyond this, we are subjected to tour buses driving past our house when cruise ships are in and having people stare and glare into our yard of privacy, invading us. Its embarrassing and bordering harassment.

My objection is this, If I should want to have a private yard for myself and my family, to entertain friends, and to do so without feeling vulnerable and exposed, as a rate payer and property owner who works hard to pay his way, I should be allowed to.

I have no issue if I had to build a stucco fence at 2 meters high to keep in character, but I should have that option at least.

The current paradox is that the existing eyesore wooden pale fence is legally allowed to stay, and I am allowed to replace like for like if I need to, or even let it become run down and a shambles. However should I want to upgrade and keep with the up market

art deco stucco look, im not allowed.

Furthermore I can not put enough emphasis on security and privacy. In todays society of meth heads and low socio economic issues, the council should be taking into consideration these factors. There is as much argument for having security fencing and privacy as to not having it because criminals wont burgle a visible property. Our neighbor's across the road have a open front yard and a private back yard and have been burgled numerous times, including while they were in the house.

It should not be Councils place to determine how its ratepayers should exercise their rights of privacy and security, and more so for someone such as myself with two road frontages.

There is no rate relief package or offer to home owners such as myself to be dictated too on fence heights in order to keep the NCC, art deco trust , the cruise ships and other beneficiaries of the art deco glam forcing us to be caged spectacles in the art deco zoo.

### **Relief sought**

I would like consideration given to greater allowances for corner sights.

I would like road front fences in the art deco zone to be allowed to be built to 2 meters as long as they have an approved art deco design.

At the very least existing fences should be allowed to be replaced with a friendlier art deco design.