
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: 08/12/2023

Submission Reference Number #:78

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

Submitter:

Peter Grant

Address for service:

Peter Grant
35 Ngarimu Crescent Napier 4140
New Zealand

Email: communityservices@napier.govt.nz

I wish to be heard: Yes

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 78.1

Section: HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Sub-section: Objectives

Provision:

[Development](#) and activities contribute to safety, security, social wellbeing, and connectivity in communities.

Relates to [GRZ-12](#) and [GRZ-14](#)

Sentiment: Amend

Submission:

Napier's Positive Ageing Strategy Advisory Group supports enabling provision of housing diversity, to accommodate the needs of our growing older population with a variety of housing choices near to services and amenities, including but not limited to public transport, medical centres, pharmacies, banking facilities, stores.

We would like to see some of the offerings in the new medium and high density zones dedicated for accommodation for older people, with associated shared facilities such as gardens, laundry, etc.

Housing choices need to be of high quality (specific to older people), designed using CPTED principles to enhance community and resident safety, and facilitate social connection.

Relief sought

We recommend Council incentivises developers to build properties suitable for older residents by requiring builds that reflect Universal Design, potentially permitting a slight increase in site coverage in exchange for an independent Universal Design certification of any new dwelling (see attached case study).

[Thames Coromandel District Council case study](#)

Point 78.2

Section: HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Sub-section: Objectives

Provision:

[Development](#) and activities provide quality living environments for residents while recognising the amenity provided in the nearby centre and public open space.

Relates to [GRZ-12](#) and [GRZ-14](#)

Sentiment: Support

Submission:

Napier's Positive Ageing Strategy Advisory Group supports protection of parks and reserves through open space and natural space zones to retain green spaces for Napier, particularly as housing density increases. Higher density housing areas will introduce a need for open spaces so older people (and the wider population) can exercise and enjoy the outdoors, particularly if properties have limited outdoor space on site.

Relief sought

Nil

Point 78.3

Section: HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Sub-section: Policies

Provision:

Enable a variety of housing typologies with a mix of densities within the zone, including attached and detached dwellings and apartments.

Relates to [HRZ-O1](#) and [HRZ-O4](#)

Sentiment: Support

Submission:

Napier's Positive Ageing Strategy Advisory Group supports enabling provision of housing diversity, to accommodate the needs of our growing older population with a variety of housing choices near to services and amenities, including but not limited to public transport, medical centres, pharmacies, banking facilities, stores.

We would like to see some of the offerings in the new medium and high density zones dedicated for accommodation for older people, with associated shared facilities such as gardens, laundry, etc.

Housing choices need to be of high quality (specific to older people), designed using CPTED principles to enhance community and resident safety, and facilitate social connection.

Relief sought

Nil

Point 78.4

Section: MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

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

Provision:

MRZ-R1A

Activity Status: Permitted

Where:

1. One [residential unit](#) per [site](#).

Note: [Minor residential units](#) are considered standard [residential units](#) subject to this rule within the Medium Density Residential Zone.

MRZ-R1B

Activity Status where activity conditions are not met:

Restricted Discretionary

Matters of discretion are:

1. Housing supply and diversity;
2. Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces;
3. Quality living environments; and
4. [Infrastructure](#) capacity and [stormwater](#) management.

Notification status: Any application under this rule is precluded from being notified on a public or limited basis.

Sentiment: Amend

Submission:

We recommend Council incentivises developers to build properties suitable for older residents by requiring builds that reflect Universal Design, potentially permitting a slight increase in site coverage in exchange for an independent Universal Design certification of any new dwelling (see attached case study).

[Thames Coromandel District Council Universal Design case study](#)

Relief sought

We recommend Council incentivises developers to build properties suitable for older residents by requiring builds that reflect Universal Design, potentially permitting a slight increase in site coverage in exchange for an independent Universal Design certification of any new dwelling (see attached case study).

Point 78.5

Section: HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Sub-section: Policies

Provision:

Require [development](#) to achieve quality living environments for residents by providing:

- a. private open space that has access to sunlight;
- b. a reasonable level of visual privacy and outlook;
- c. opportunities for on-[site](#) landscaping, and
- d. safe and convenient pedestrian access to [residential units](#) from the street.

Relates to [HRZ-O3](#)

Sentiment: Amend

Submission:

Napier's Positive Ageing Strategy Advisory Group requests safe and accessible parking areas in high density developments, particularly for mobility permit holders, the number of which is growing in size. Accessible parking close to developments is essential.

Universal Design considerations need to be fully implemented to enable equitable access to and within high density residential zones by older people and people with limited mobility.

Relief sought

Safe and accessible parking areas need to provide access to mobility car parking and mobility scooter parking, and e-charging for both.

Point 78.6

Section: MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Sub-section: Policies

Provision:

Manage [development](#) to achieve a quality living [environment](#) for residents within the [site](#), including by providing:

- a. useable and accessible [outdoor living space](#) appropriate for the location and housing typology;
- b. privacy;
- c. access to sunlight;
- d. functional living spaces;
- e. storage, and
- f. safe and accessible parking areas.

Relates to [MRZ-O3](#)

Sentiment: Amend

Submission:

Napier's Positive Ageing Strategy Advisory Group supports safe and accessible parking areas in medium density developments.

Mobility car parking and scooter parking need to be specifically included.

Relief sought

Safe and accessible parking areas need to provide access to mobility car parking and mobility scooter parking, and e-charging for both.

Point 78.7

Section: GRZ - General Residential Zone

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

Provision:

***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: Support

Submission:

Napier's Positive Ageing Strategy Advisory Group supports the proposed standards for fences and walls. Safety and visibility from and to the street are important for older people, particularly for those living alone.

Social connections within neighbourhoods are important and lower fence heights go some way towards achieving this.

Passive surveillance of the streetscape also helps with crime prevention - a basic CPTED principle.

Our comments also apply to MRZ-S8, HRZ-S8, and LLRZ-S8.

Relief sought

We recommend design guidelines are prepared to ensure utilisation of appropriate fence design and products.

Point 78.8

Section: MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Sub-section: Policies

Provision:

Enable a variety of housing typologies with a mix of densities within the zone, including terraced housing and low-rise apartments.

Relates to [MRZ-O1](#) and [MRZ-O4](#)

Sentiment: Amend

Submission:

Napier's Positive Ageing Strategy Advisory Group supports enabling provision of housing diversity, to accommodate the needs of our growing older population with a variety of housing choices near to services and amenities, including but not limited to public transport, medical centres, pharmacies, banking facilities, stores.

We would like to see some of the offerings in the new medium and high density zones dedicated for accommodation for older people, with associated shared facilities such as gardens, laundry, etc.

Housing choices need to be of high quality (specific to older people), designed using CPTED principles to enhance community and resident safety, and facilitate social connection.

Relief sought

We recommend Council incentivises developers to build properties suitable for older residents by requiring builds that reflect Universal Design, potentially permitting a slight increase in site coverage in exchange for an independent Universal Design certification of any new dwelling (see attached case study). [Thames Coromandel District Council Universal Design case study](#)

Point 78.9

Section: HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Sub-section: Objectives

Provision:

[Land](#) that has good accessibility by existing or planned active or public transport to a range of [commercial activities](#), public open space, and community services, is efficiently used for high-density urban living that increases housing supply and choice.

Relates to [GRZ-I1](#)

Sentiment: Amend

Submission:

Napier's Positive Ageing Strategy Advisory Group supports enabling provision of housing diversity, to accommodate the needs of our growing older population with a variety of housing choices near to services and amenities, including but not limited to public transport, medical centres, pharmacies, banking facilities, stores.

We would like to see some of the offerings in the new medium and high density zones dedicated for accommodation for older people, with associated shared facilities such as gardens, laundry, etc.

Housing choices need to be of high quality (specific to older people), designed using CPTED principles to enhance community and resident safety, and facilitate social connection.

Relief sought

We recommend Council incentivises developers to build properties suitable for older residents by requiring builds that reflect Universal Design, potentially permitting a slight increase in site coverage in exchange for an independent Universal Design certification of any new dwelling (see attached case study).

[Thames Coromandel District Council Universal Design case study](#)

Point 78.10

Section: HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Sub-section: Policies

Provision:

Manage [development](#) to contribute to safe, attractive, and connected streets and public open space, including by:

- a. providing visibility for passive surveillance over the street and public open space;
- b. providing [front yard setbacks](#), landscaping, and permeable fencing;
- c. minimising visual dominance of large [buildings](#), garages, and servicing and waste storage areas, and
- d. providing publicly accessible connections through large [sites](#), where practicable.

Relates to [HRZ-O2](#)

Sentiment: Amend

Submission:

Napier's Positive Ageing Strategy Advisory Group supports protection of parks and reserves through open space and natural space zones to retain green spaces for Napier, particularly as housing density increases. Higher density housing areas will introduce a need for open spaces so older people (and the wider population) can exercise and enjoy the outdoors, particularly if properties have limited outdoor space on site.

Our comments also apply to OSZ-P4.

Relief sought

Provide for minimum public open space zones, which are easily accessible, in high density residential areas.

Point 78.11

Section: TPT - Transport

Sub-section: Policies

Provision:

Manage the design and location of [subdivision](#), use, and [development](#) of [land](#) so as to minimise traffic patterns that will interfere with the safe and efficient operation of the integrated transport network, including through:

- a. ensuring transport planning supports the anticipated activities in each zone.
- b. only providing for high trip generating activities where they:
 - i. safely and effectively integrate with the transport network, and
 - ii. provide for pedestrian, cycling, micro-mobility, and public transport modes.

Relates to [TPT-01](#)

Sentiment: Amend

Submission:

Consideration needs to be given explicitly to separating mobility scooters from the general terminology of 'micro mobility'. Our city's population is ageing, and approximately half of our population over 65 live with a disability. This means more and more people will be using out pathways and/or roadways on mobility scooters. Shared pathways may not be the answer with multi-modal micro-mobility options. Suitable, safe pathways will be required.

Relief sought

Include specific mention of mobility scooters in planning effective and safe integration with the transport network.

Point 78.12

Section: TPT - Transport

Sub-section: Policies

Provision:

Manage the design and location of [subdivision](#), use, and [development](#) of [land](#) to optimise connectivity, including through:

- a. providing a connected roading network, including minimising the use of cul-de-sacs where practicable;
- b. establishing safe cycleways and walkways and enhancing the safety of existing cycle and pedestrian routes;
- c. implementing [CPTED](#) (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) principles;
- d. supporting initiatives to increase use of public transport;
- e. ensuring that [infrastructure](#) associated with active transport and public transport modes is safe, convenient, and accessible to all sectors of the community, and
- f. designing intersections to facilitate safe and efficient crossing for all vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians.

Relates to [TPT-01](#), [TPT-03](#), and [TPT-04](#)

Sentiment: Amend

Submission:

Enabling connectivity to multiple escape routes is important for residents, particularly older residents who may have less mobility, in the event of an emergency evacuation.

Development of subdivisions and land needs to build in evacuation routes where dead-end cul-de-sacs and associated pedestrian/cycle routes /alleyways are not the only option available.

Our comments also apply to SUB-P7 and SUB-AC1.

Relief sought

Development of subdivisions and land needs to build in evacuation routes where dead-end cul-de-sacs and associated pedestrian/cycle routes /alleyways are not the only option available to residents, especially those with limited mobility, for evacuation.

Point 78.13

Section: TPT - Transport

Sub-section: Policies

Provision:

Manage the design of parking areas and the number, location, and type of loading spaces, including bicycle parking and associated end-of-trip facilities to support all of the following:

- a. the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the transport network;
- b. the use of public transport, cycling, and walking;
- c. the functional and operational requirements of activities;
- d. the efficient use of [land](#);
- e. the recognition that different activities have different trip characteristics;
- f. the efficient use of on-street parking and off-street parking;
- g. the character and amenity of the relevant zone;
- h. the provision of quality living environments in residential zones, and
- i. the vibrancy of the City Centre and Town [Centre Zones](#).

Relates to [TPT-01](#), [TPT-03](#), and [TPT-04](#)

Sentiment: Amend

Submission:

Consideration needs to be given and specific mention made on the provision of mobility car parking. The number and placement of mobility car parks need to be commensurate with the anticipated demand as our city ages.

There is likely to be an estimated 32% increase in mobility parking permits between 2021 and 2033, rising from 2,412 permits to approximately 3,184. This increase will require an associated increase in the provision of mobility car parking in the city from the current 65 in 2022.

Mobility parking permit holders have the opportunity to bring vibrancy to the City Centre and Town Centre Zones when there is adequate provision of mobility parking.

Quality living environments in residential zones requires having access to adequate, accessible mobility parking close to or as part of residential developments.

Efficient placement of mobility parks also needs to be articulated in the plan (ie, near to services and shops, in blocks of multiple parks for users' convenience).

Our comments also apply to TPT-R1A, HRC-P4, and MRZ-P4.

Relief sought

Include specific mention of mobility car parking in the management of the design of parking areas and associated number and location considerations.

Include specific considerations for access to mobility car parks in all residential zones.

[Napier Mobility Car Parking Review summary report](#)

Point 78.14

Section: TPT - Transport

Sub-section: TPT - Transport - Standards Table

Provision:

Purpose: *to encourage cycling as a mode of transport by providing safe, secure, and accessible bike parking facilities.*

1. One bike stand must be provided per five car park spaces on [site](#), except for supermarkets where one bike stand must be provided per 20 car park spaces.
2. The bike stands must meet the following requirements:
 - a. they must be securely attached to a wall or the ground and support the bike frame;
 - b. each bike stand shall be adequately spaced to allow a cyclist to manoeuvre and attach a bike to the stand;
 - c. the bike stand shall allow the bike to be secured, and
 - d. they shall be visible and signposted.
3. Non-residential activities must provide the following end-of-trip facilities (intended for staff use):

Matters of discretion are:

1. Functional requirements of the activity;
2. Public health and community wellbeing, and
3. Safety and efficiency of the integrated transportation network.

0-14 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) staff	No requirement.
15-49 FTE staff	One male and one female shower (or two unisex) and changing facilities.
50+ FTE staff	Two male and two female showers (or three unisex) and changing facilities.

Sentiment: Amend

Submission:

The proposed standard for bike parking includes no mention about facilities for e-bikes, in particular charging stations.

The standards also provide no mention of covered bike parking.

If the aim of this standard is to encourage cycling as a mode of transport by providing safe, secure, and accessible bike parking facilities, Napier's Positive Ageing Strategy Advisory Group would expect to see this reflected in the standard with the inclusion of the aforementioned requirements.

We need to encourage more people to cycle and use active forms of transport, not only to reduce emissions, but also to foster improved health and wellbeing. As our population ages, it is likely we will see even more older people taking up cycling, a popular pastime in the Hawke's Bay with its many tracks and trails.

Relief sought

Napier's Positive Ageing Strategy Advisory Group requests inclusion of minimum requirements for secure e-bike charging stations, and secure covered bicycle parking at outdoor sites.

Point 78.15

Section: NOSZ - Natural Open Space Zone

Sub-section: Policies

Provision:

Manage [development](#) to achieve quality natural open space environments including by:

- a. Limiting [buildings](#) and [structures](#) to those necessary to enhance people's ability to use and enjoy the open space;
- b. Locating and designing [buildings](#), [structures](#), and car parking areas to complement the natural character, function, and [amenity values](#) of the zone;
- c. Requiring landscaping to mitigate the visual [effects](#) of [buildings](#), [structures](#), and vehicle parking areas;
- d. Managing vehicle access, parking, and traffic generation;
- e. Enhancing access and connectivity to the surrounding neighbourhood, and
- f. Minimising shading, privacy, and [noise effects](#) on adjacent residential properties.

Relates to [NOSZ-O2](#)

Sentiment: Amend

Submission:

Napier's Positive Ageing Strategy Advisory Group is supportive of retaining and enhancing the natural environment by ensuring that activities, buildings and other structures are compatible with the natural characteristics of the zone.

As a city, we should be encouraging more people to make use of all the city has to offer. With our growing older population, we need to make sure these spaces are accessible to all. This is particularly important with the anticipated increase in housing developments, and the proposed introduction of medium and high-density residential zones.

Our comments also apply to OSZ-P4.

Relief sought

The emphasis here is on *quality*. To ensure a quality experience, Napier's Positive Ageing Strategy Advisory Group requests a clear focus on accessibility to and through these spaces in the form of suitable parking and pathways in particular, and provision of adequate resting points which make use of quality seating areas (accessible park benches of adequate height with arm support).

This can be achieved while ensuring structures are compatible with the natural characteristics of the zone.

Point 78.16

Section: OSZ - Open Space Zone

Sub-section: Policies

Provision:

Manage [development](#) to achieve quality open space environments including by:

- a. limiting number and size of [buildings](#) and [structures](#) to those necessary to enhance people's ability to use and enjoy the open space.
- b. locating and designing [buildings](#), [structures](#), and car parking areas to:
 - i. reflect the local context and identity of an area;

- ii. celebrate estuarine and coastal features where appropriate;
 - iii. maintain identified natural, heritage, and/or [mana whenua](#) values
 - iv. provide safe and accessible places, and
 - v. create flexible and adaptable open space that meet changing community needs.
- c. using landscaping to mitigate the visual [effects](#) of [buildings](#), [structures](#), and vehicle parking areas.
 - d. managing vehicle access, parking, and traffic generation.
 - e. enhancing access and connectivity to the surrounding neighbourhood.
 - f. managing [development](#) to maintain a reasonable standard of amenity for adjacent residential properties.

Relates to [OSZ-03](#)

Sentiment: Amend

Submission:

Napier's Positive Ageing Strategy Advisory Group is supportive of providing quality natural open space environments for passive and active recreational opportunities, along with the necessary facilities and structures to support them.

As a city, we should be encouraging more people to make use of all the city has to offer. We saw the shift in the use of public open space environments during Covid pandemic lockdowns and there is an opportunity here to provide spaces that are inclusive.

With our growing older population, we need to make sure these spaces are accessible to all. This is particularly important with the anticipated increase in housing developments, and the proposed introduction of medium and high-density residential zones.

Our comments also apply to NOSZ-P2.

Relief sought

The emphasis here is on *quality*. To ensure a quality experience, Napier's Positive Ageing Strategy Advisory Group requests a clear focus on accessibility to and through these spaces in the form of suitable parking and pathways, and consideration of adequate resting points which make use of quality seating areas (accessible park benches of adequate height with arm support).

Point 78.17

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.

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.

- b. Within the side and rear yards: 2 m.

Sentiment: Support

Submission:

Napier's Positive Ageing Strategy Advisory Group supports the proposed standards for fences and walls. Safety and visibility from and to the street are important for older people, particularly for those living alone. Social connections within neighbourhoods are important and lower fence heights go some way towards achieving this. Passive surveillance of the streetscape also helps with crime prevention. Comments also apply to MRZ-S8, HRZ-S8, and LLRZ-S8.

Relief sought

We recommend design guidelines are prepared to ensure utilisation of appropriate fence design and products.

Point 78.18

Section: HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Sub-section: HRZ - High Density Residential Zone - Standards Table

Provision:

HRZ-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; or
 - 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. Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces, and
3. Quality living environments.

Sentiment: Support

Submission:

Napier's Positive Ageing Strategy Advisory Group supports the proposed standards for fences and walls. Safety and visibility from and to the street are important for older people, particularly for those living alone. Social connections within neighbourhoods are important and lower fence heights go some way towards achieving this. Passive surveillance of the streetscape also helps with crime prevention. Comments also apply to MRZ-S8, HRZ-S8, and LLRZ-S8.

Relief sought

We recommend design guidelines are prepared to ensure utilisation of appropriate fence design and products.

Point 78.19

Section: LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone

Sub-section: LLRZ - Large Lot Residential Zone - Standards Table

Provision:

LLRZ-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; 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. Spacious peri-urban character;
3. Safety, attractiveness, and connectivity of streets and public open spaces, and
4. Quality living environments.

Sentiment: Support

Submission:

Napier's Positive Ageing Strategy Advisory Group supports the proposed standards for fences and walls. Safety and visibility from and to the street are important for older people, particularly for those living alone. Social connections within neighbourhoods are important and lower fence heights go some way towards achieving this. Passive surveillance of the streetscape also helps with crime prevention. Comments also apply to MRZ-S8, HRZ-S8, and LLRZ-S8.

Relief sought

We recommend design guidelines are prepared to ensure utilisation of appropriate fence design and products.

Point 78.20

Section: OSZ - Open Space Zone

Sub-section: Policies

Provision:

OSZ-P4: Quality open space environments

Manage development to achieve quality open space environments including by:

- a. limiting number and size of buildings and structures to those necessary to enhance people's ability to use and enjoy the open space.
- b. locating and designing buildings, structures, and car parking areas to:
 - i. reflect the local context and identity of an area;
 - ii. celebrate estuarine and coastal features where appropriate;
 - iii. maintain identified natural, heritage, and/or mana whenua values
 - iv. provide safe and accessible places, and
 - v. create flexible and adaptable open space that meet changing community needs.
- c. using landscaping to mitigate the visual effects of buildings, structures, and vehicle parking areas.
- d. managing vehicle access, parking, and traffic generation.
- e. enhancing access and connectivity to the surrounding neighbourhood.
- f. managing development to maintain a reasonable standard of amenity for adjacent residential properties.

Relates to OSZ-O3

Sentiment:**Submission:**

Napier's Positive Ageing Strategy Advisory Group supports protection of parks and reserves through open space and natural space zones to retain green spaces for Napier, particularly as housing density increases. Higher density housing areas will introduce a need for open spaces so older people (and the wider population) can exercise and enjoy the outdoors, particularly if properties have limited outdoor space on site

Relief sought

Provide for minimum public open space zones, which are easily accessible, in high density residential areas.

Point 78.21

Section: SUB - Subdivision

Sub-section: Policies

Provision:

SUB-P7: Providing for connectivity

Manage the design and location of subdivision to optimise connectivity, including through:

- a. providing a connected roading network, including minimising the use of cul-de-sacs in urban areas where practicable;
- b. establishing safe cycleways and walkways and enhancing the safety of existing cycle and pedestrian routes;
- c. implementing CPTED principles;
- d. supporting initiatives to increase accessibility to, and use of, public transport;
- e. ensuring that infrastructure associated with active transport and public transport modes is safe, convenient, and accessible to all sectors of the community;
- f. designing intersections to facilitate safe and efficient crossing for all vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians, and
- g. provide for the efficient evacuation of people inland or to higher ground from sites located in tsunami inundation areas.

Relates to SUB-O3

Sentiment: Amend

Submission:

Enabling connectivity to multiple escape routes is important for residents, particularly older residents who may have less mobility, in the event of an emergency evacuation.

Development of subdivisions and land needs to build in evacuation routes where dead-end cul-de-sacs and associated pedestrian/cycle routes /alleyways are not the only option available.

Relief sought

Development of subdivisions and land needs to build in evacuation routes where dead-end cul-de-sacs and associated pedestrian/cycle routes /alleyways are not the only option available to residents, especially those with limited mobility, for evacuation

Point 78.22

Section: SUB - Subdivision

Sub-section: Assessment criteria

Provision:

SUB-AC1: General, applies to all subdivision (including boundary adjustments)

Purpose of the relevant zone, precinct, or development area

- a. Whether compliance with the rules of the zone, precinct and/or development area in which subdivision is taking place is able to be met and whether the subdivision is consistent with all relevant objectives and policies.

Safe, connected, and efficient transport network

- b. The extent to which the Transportation chapter standards for vehicle access and manoeuvring are able to be complied with, including TPT-S4 and TPT-S6.
- c. The extent to which the subdivision considers:
 - i. opportunities for direct connections to existing roads, pathways and cycle ways in the surrounding neighborhood;
 - ii. the future development of adjoining land;
 - iii. the safety of vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists;
 - iv. the design and construction of roads in relation to Council's Roading Hierarchy;
 - v. the requirements of Waka Kotahi with regard to vehicle entrances onto state highways, and
 - vi. whether the subdivision and/or land development provides adequate measures to meet increases in traffic.
- d. Limiting the use of cul-de-sacs unless constrained by topography, infrastructure, or geotechnical factors. Where cul-de-sacs cannot be avoided, they should, where appropriate, provide pedestrian and cycle links to other streets and/or open spaces to ensure connectivity and accessibility.
- e. Whether connectivity is able to be achieved.

Stormwater and infrastructure

- f. The extent to which the subdivision infrastructure has considered low-impact design methods to effectively manage

stormwater to prevent flooding, erosion, and discharge of contaminants while positively contributing to amenity, improved biodiversity, and cultural values.

g. Compliance with the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure.

Whether the sites created by subdivision can be sufficiently serviced by water, stormwater, wastewater, and network utilities (power lines, gas distribution pipes and telecommunication lines.) **Note:** Council will not accept public infrastructure that is located in gated communities.

h. Whether Council is able to accept the vesting of infrastructure.

i. When the site is not proposed to be connected to a public water supply:

- i. the ability for the site to effectively and efficiently meet firefighting requirements, and
- ii. the ability to show how the site will be serviced by an acceptable alternative water supply.

j. When the site will not be connected to a public wastewater or stormwater network, sufficient space is available for onsite wastewater and stormwater attenuation and treatment, and disposal systems will not cause environmental effects on or beyond the site.

Natural hazards

k. Whether the land, or any potential structure on that land, will be subject to material damage by erosion, falling debris, subsidence, slippage, or inundation from any source.

l. Whether there are any methods/measures available to overcome or reduce the risk of any hazard(s), and whether these methods/measures may have any significant adverse effects on the environment.

m. Whether techniques proposed for the remediation and/or mitigation of liquefaction and/or lateral spread hazards are appropriate, including but not limited to:

- i. provision for ground-strengthening, foundation design, provision of resilient services, and the ability of these to be incorporated into the subdivision consent as conditions or consent notices;
- ii. setbacks in relation to any waterbody or whether any ground strengthening geoengineering solutions are identified to address any potential for lateral spread, and
- iii. the extent to which the layout of the subdivision in relation to the liquefaction and/or lateral spread hazards are appropriate, including the proposed location of earthworks, roads, access, servicing, and building platforms.

n. In assessing the above matters, the Council will have regard to the following:

- i. any information held on the Council's Natural Hazard Database and the Hawke's Bay Hazards Map Portal;
- ii. the objectives, policies, and rules of the Natural Hazards chapter of the District Plan (*Note: The provisions relating to Natural Hazards have not been included in the Proposed District Plan and will be released at a later date as a variation. Please refer to the Natural Hazards provisions (including maps) in the Operative District Plan*);
- iii. information by suitably qualified professionals whose investigations are supplied with subdivision consent applications, and
- iv. the provision of any consent notice in terms of Section 221 of the Act for subdivision in hazard areas.

Heritage values

o. Whether the proposed subdivision and/or land development has the potential to adversely affect heritage and/or archaeological sites.

p. The extent to which the site layout will compromise the character of the heritage or amenity precinct as described in the character statements in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Overlay and Precinct Schedule.

Cultural values

q. Whether the design of the development recognises and respects cultural values to reflect the whakapapa, ancestral

names, history, and stories of the area.

Landscape and topographical features

- r. The extent to which the subdivision design works with the natural topography and landscape features of a site.
- s. Whether the impact of the scale and intensity of the subdivision and/or land development is compatible with the landscape and topographical features.
- t. The effects of property access, road reserves, and drainage reserves on the site as they impact on landscape amenity values.
- u. For subdivisions within landscape overlays, the extent to which the subdivision design mitigates potential effects on the landscape values identified in Schedule 2.

Natural features and indigenous trees and vegetation

- v. The extent to which subdivision design retains any natural features of the sites, including indigenous and mature trees and vegetation.
- w. The extent to which the subdivision design includes native plantings for the purpose of enhancing biodiversity.
- x. Whether the proposed subdivision and/or land development will have any effects on ecosystems, including flora and fauna and their habitats.
- y. For areas of indigenous vegetation, whether an assessment and classification under the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity 2023, Appendix 1, is required.

Management of construction effects

- z. The extent to which construction effects will need to be managed through a construction management plan, having regard to the following:
 - i. traffic movements during construction phase;
 - ii. noise management;
 - iii. hours of operation, and
 - iv. erosion and sediment control measures.

Management of potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing land uses

- aa. The extent to which the subdivision design considers reverse sensitivity effects on existing or permitted activities, including avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects on land based primary production activities and highly productive land. Design mitigation techniques may include but are not limited to: planting, setbacks, locating non-sensitive components of land uses in the most affected areas, etc.
- ab. Effects to be mitigated may include noise, odour, spray drift, dust, vibration, and traffic.

Sentiment: Amend

Submission:

Enabling connectivity to multiple escape routes is important for residents, particularly older residents who may have less mobility, in the event of an emergency evacuation.

Development of subdivisions and land needs to build in evacuation routes where dead-end cul-de-sacs and associated pedestrian/cycle routes /alleyways are not the only option available.

Relief sought

Development of subdivisions and land needs to build in evacuation routes where dead-end cul-de-sacs and associated pedestrian/cycle

routes /alleyways are not the only option available to residents, especially those with limited mobility, for evacuation.