

# MUZ - Mixed Use Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S14: Fences and walls	Susan Dallas	25.14	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S14: Fences and walls	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.14	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Issues /MUZ-I1: Mix of activities	John Sandall	85.1	Oppose	Opposes the General Industrial Zone over Ahuriri. Seeking this area be rezoned to Mixed Use Zone.	Amend the Ahuriri General Industrial Zone to Mixed Use Zone.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R5: Residential activity	Andrea Millar	105.17	Support	Supports the permitted activity rules applying to “residential activity” in the zone as appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided by Ara Poutama.	Retain permitted activity rule MUZ-R5 applying to “residential activities” in the Mixed Use Zone.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /General	Andrea Millar	105.19	Oppose	Opposes the activity rules applying to community corrections activity” as they do not enable community corrections activities, and provides non-complying activity status for these activities in the zone under MUZ-R17. Considers the importance of Community corrections activities and the need to enable non-custodial community corrections sites including within the zone which is easily accessible to offenders, where commercial, community and other similar activities are enabled as of right, often provide suitable sites for community work activities, including larger site sizes for yard-based activities and large equipment and/or vehicle storage.	Amend to insert a new permitted activity rule for “community corrections activities” in the Mixed Use Zone, as follows:  <u>MUZ-RX: Community corrections activities</u> <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u> <u>NA</u>	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Assessment criteria /MUZ-AC1: New buildings not meeting permitted standards (MUZ-R1)	Pip Beachen	142.10	Oppose	Opposes the introduction of the Hastings Residential Intensification Design Guide into the statutory assessment process. Considers it is a useful tool to achieve quality design outcomes, however would introduce an additional layer of subjectivity and uncertainty. Seeks its retention as a non-statutory guidance document only, with resource consents to be assessed against concise ‘material’ development criteria in the District Plan.	Delete assessment Criteria MUZ-AC1(b), (i) and (j). Retain the remaining assessment criteria for new buildings being (a), (c) – (h).	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S6: Impervious area	Pip Beachen	142.45	Amend	Considers that Most of the sites within the proposed Mixed Use Zone are currently covered by 100% impervious surfaces. Opposes this standard in its current form as it places further restriction on sites compared to their existing situation. The stormwater rules will apply to any additional impervious area in this zone which will assist in managing stormwater discharge to the network without needing to further restrict impervious areas in this zone.	Amend to provide for 100% impervious area.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S7: Landscaped area	Pip Beachen	142.46	Oppose	Opposes as very few sites within the proposed Mixed Use Zone area have any landscaping currently. Considers that requiring 20% landscaping is a significant and onerous change to how these sites can be developed. Considers that landscape and streetscape character outcomes are better addressed through the Yards and Frontages Rules as they have been applied in Standards MUZ-S3 and MUZ-S4 respectively	Delete this landscaping requirement to better reflect the existing character of the sites within this zone.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S8: Open space	Pip Beachen	142.47	Oppose	Opposes the wording of MUZ-S8(3) and seeks further clarity around the interpretation of this standard.	Amend or delete MUZ-S8(3) as further clarity is required.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S13: Garages	Pip Beachen	142.48	Oppose	Opposes this standard as notified as it has the potential to significantly restrict the ability to provide two-three level terraced houses facing the street, which may limit the viability of achieving this form. Considers that the standard will produce generic outcomes providing for facades with no modulation. Design assessment criteria can address the relationship of dwellings to the street without requiring this restrictive control.	Delete MUZ-S13.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /General	Pip Beachen	142.58	Amend	Considers that it is important that the standards appropriately facilitate the outcomes sought by Council for the City and further enable efficient development of sites while achieving onsite amenity and maintain an appropriate and transparent standard of amenity for adjacent residents. Seeks to ensure that the standards across the relevant zones (GRZ, MRZ, HRZ, MUZ) are workable and provide for practical outcomes when actually implemented onsite.	Seeks that standards across the relevant zones (GRZ, MRZ, HRZ, MUZ) are workable and provide for practical outcomes when actually implemented onsite. Seeks Amendments or the removal of standards which are overly onerous for residential development or which result in contradicting outcomes to other standards, therefore seeking a consistent approach within each Zone and across the Plan.	Open Submission

# MUZ - Mixed Use Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S3: Yards	Sheena McGuire	168.119	Amend	Notes that MUZ Chapter does not contain a specific rail corridor building setback standard and there is no yard setback that applies to the corridor. In the case of rail, a setback provides a safe physical distance between a building and the railway corridor boundary. Heavy freight trains run on the railway lines through the Napier City District. Without a sufficient setback, people painting their buildings, clearing gutters or doing works on their roof will need to access or foul the rail corridor. Considers that if a person or object encroaches onto the rail corridor, there is a substantial risk of injury or death for the person entering the rail corridor. A setback control has obvious safety benefits for the users of the land adjoining the rail corridor and users of the rail corridor. Also notes the efficiency benefits for rail operations, by mitigating against the risk of train services being interrupted by unauthorised persons or objects entering the rail corridor. Considers that without appropriate setback requirements, there is significant risk of adverse health and safety effects impacting people locating and working in proximity to the railway corridor. Seeks a new clause within MUZ-S3 to require a 5m setback for structures and buildings from the rail corridor. Matters of discretion are also sought in the case that the setback cannot be achieved.	Amend as follows: 1. There is no front yard requirement, except that a minimum 3m landscaped yard comprised of indigenous plants is required where sites: a. front onto Pandora Road, and b. adjoin a site that is zoned Residential. 2. There is no side or rear yard requirement, except that no part of any building must be located within 6 m of a residential zone site boundary or Tyne Street drain. 3. <u>No part of any building or structure may be located within a 5m setback from a boundary shared with a rail corridor.</u>  Matters of discretion are: 1. Purpose of the standard; 2. Quality living environments; 3. Amenity values; 4. Character of the area; 5. Operation and maintenance of watercourses and open	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R1: New buildings	Cameron Drury	179.2	Oppose	It seems nonsensical to limit the gross floor area of new buildings to 400m2. There is no specific policy support for this, while a limit of 400m2 risks implementation of MUZ-P1.	Delete Rule	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R3: Commercial activity outside the city centre fringe control area	Cameron Drury	179.3	Amend	Make changes to this rule to improve clarity and avoid stand alone commercial, office accommodation or retail activities falling to be assessed as a non-complying activity under MUZ-R17.	Insert new Rule to provide for office accommodation and retail activities within limits as a Permitted Activity in a similar manner as PREC10-R2A.  Amend the activity description of MUZ-R3A as follows:  <u>Commercial Activity (including office accommodation and retail activities) outside the city center fringe control area'</u>  Or  Insert new rule to provide for commercial office accommodation and retail activities not otherwise provided for under Rule MUZ-R3A and the new permitted activity rule as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /	Cameron Drury	179.4	Amend	The zone should provide for Hospitality activities without these falling to be assessed as a non-complying activity under MUZ-R17.	Insert new rule to provide for Hospitality activities as a Permitted Activity where appropriate and as Restricted Discretionary Activity otherwise.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S3: Yards	Cameron Drury	179.13	Oppose	MUZ-S3(2) - A 6m set back from a residential site boundary does not enable optimal use of a site and is considered excessive to maintaining residential amenity when a MUZ-S2 would apply (height in relation to boundary)	Reduce to setback 1 m.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S8: Open space	Cameron Drury	179.14	Oppose	MUZ-S8(3) - Seems excessive for when higher density is encouraged and also impractical for open space areas above ground floors. This rule is also less important in Hawkes Bay than other areas of the country. Shaded outdoor areas can be valuable during the summer.	Amend or delete the requirement for open space to not be south facing.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S9: Residential Outlook space	Cameron Drury	179.15	Oppose	Seems excessive for when higher density is encouraged.	Amend or delete and place as an Assessment Criteria.	Open Submission

# MUZ - Mixed Use Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S12: Storage of shipping containers	Cameron Drury	179.16	Oppose	Likely to only allow a single shipping container. In a zone where light industry is provided for the stacking of two shipping containers would not be unreasonable and would be lesser in height than a new building complying with the height limit which may have more significant effects.	Amend the height limit to allow the stacking of two shipping containers.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S13: Garages	Cameron Drury	179.17	Oppose	MUZ-13(2)-(3) - Compromises variety in design – risks straight facades with no modulation.	Consider the best tool to achieve the outcome sought and make provision for narrow lots. This may include deleting the standard and relying on assessment criteria for multi-unit developments, or amendments to the standard.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S14: Fences and walls	Cameron Drury	179.18	Amend	The purpose relates only to residential activities but would otherwise apply to every activity.	Amend to apply to only residential activities.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Assessment criteria /MUZ-AC1: New buildings not meeting permitted standards (MUZ-R1)	Cameron Drury	179.20	Oppose	Consequential amendment - Not necessary with Rule MUZ-R1 deleted.	Delete	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Assessment criteria /MUZ-AC1: New buildings not meeting permitted standards (MUZ-R1)	Cameron Drury	179.21	Oppose	Criteria (b) refers to the Hastings Residential Intensification Design Guide. This should not apply to non-residential buildings.	Amend to not apply to non-residential buildings.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /General	Hus Narsai	205.11	Amend	Supports the provision for retail activities within the Mixed Use zone. Considers that explicit provision should be made for trade suppliers within the zone.	Bunnings seeks for specific provision for trade suppliers in the Large Format Retail Zone with the following activity statuses:  Trade suppliers – Restricted Discretionary	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S5: Building coverage	Hus Narsai	205.12	Oppose	Proposed restrictions on building coverage, impervious area and landscaped area as they limit the potential scale of development. There are other mechanisms to control stormwater run-off such as the provision of detention and retention for example.	Remove the proposed restrictions on building coverage, impervious area and landscaped area to provide for greater flexibility in the site layout that would better suit functional requirements of Bunnings.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S6: Impervious area	Hus Narsai	205.13	Oppose	Proposed restrictions on building coverage, impervious area and landscaped area as they limit the potential scale of development. There are other mechanisms to control stormwater run-off such as the provision of detention and retention for example.	Remove the proposed restrictions on building coverage, impervious area and landscaped area to provide for greater flexibility in the site layout that would better suit functional requirements of Bunnings.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S7: Landscaped area	Hus Narsai	205.14	Oppose	Proposed restrictions on building coverage, impervious area and landscaped area as they limit the potential scale of development. There are other mechanisms to control stormwater run-off such as the provision of detention and retention for example.	Remove the proposed restrictions on building coverage, impervious area and landscaped area to provide for greater flexibility in the site layout that would better suit functional requirements of Bunnings.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Issues /MUZ-I1: Mix of activities	Georgina McPherson	215.134	Support	The Fuel Companies are generally supportive of this Issue	Retain MUZ-I1 as notified.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Issues /MUZ-I2: Effects on the community and the economic function of centres	Georgina McPherson	215.135	Support	The Fuel Companies are generally supportive of this Issue.	Retain MUZ-I2 as notified.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Objectives /MUZ-O1: Mixed use of activities	Georgina McPherson	215.136	Support	MUZ-O1 is generally supported by the Fuel Companies.	Retain MUZ-O1 as notified.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Objectives /MUZ-O3: Effects on the community and economic function of centres	Georgina McPherson	215.137	Support	MUZ-O3 is generally supported by the Fuel Companies.	Retain MUZ-O3 as notified.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Policies /MUZ-P1: Mix of activities	Georgina McPherson	215.138	Amend	MUZ-P1 is generally supported by the Fuel Companies. However, in providing a compatible mix of activities within the zone, as sought by MUZ-P1, it is important to avoid or manage the potential for reverse sensitivity effects arising.	Amend MUZ-P1 as follows:  MUZ-P1: Mix of activities  Encourage a compatible mix of activities within the zone by:  a. providing for ...  d. avoiding new heavy industry activities, <u>and</u>  e. avoiding or managing potential reverse sensitivity <u>effects</u> .	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R12: Industrial activity	Georgina McPherson	215.139	Support	The Fuel Companies support the permissiveness of this Rule to the extent that it is applicable to land zoned MUZ at the terminals. The rule should be retained.	Retain MUSZ-R12 as notified.	Open Submission

# MUZ - Mixed Use Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R16: Service stations, transport depots, drive-through facilities	Georgina McPherson	215.140	Oppose	<p>As a commercial and retail activity, it is inappropriate to treat Service stations differently to other commercial and retail activities. This is considered to be unduly restrictive.</p> <p>In relation to meeting the MUZ standards on a permitted activity, the Fuel Companies query the appropriateness and reasonableness of setting an impervious area threshold through the impervious area standard MUZ-S6 where stormwater runoff is appropriately managed as paving of surfaces can be an appropriate means of managing the risks associated with HAIL sites and contaminated soils. Restrictions relating to impervious areas is a stormwater matter, and these matters are already dealt with in the Proposed Plan under the stormwater (SW) chapter, Part 2 – District Wide Matters and do not need to be duplicated. See full submission for more detail.</p> <p>For similar reasons, it is unreasonable to expect existing fully developed sites to achieve the minimum landscaping standard in MUZ-S7.</p> <p>For these reasons the (permitted) service station rule should not be subject to standards MUZ-S6 or MUZ-S7. In the alternative, these standards should be deleted from the zone.</p>	<p>Amend rule MUZ-R16 as follows:</p> <p>MUZ-R16: <del>Service stations, transport depots,</del> drive-through facilities</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add a new permitted rule for service stations as follows:</p> <p><u>MUZ-RX: Service stations MUZ-RXA</u></p> <p><u>Activity status: Permitted</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>1. The activity complies with standards MUZ-S1 to MUZ-S5 and MUZ-S11 to MUZ-S14.</u></p> <p><u>MUZ-RXB</u></p> <p><u>Activity status where standards are not met:</u></p> <p><u>Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u></p> <p><u>The matters of discretion stated for the relevant MUZ standard(s).</u></p>	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Assessment criteria /General	Georgina McPherson	215.141	Support	The Fuel Companies support the assessment criteria for the Mixed Use Zone and seek that they are retained.	Retain assessment criteria for the Mixed Use Zone.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R16: Service stations, transport depots, drive-through facilities	Anitha Premraj Sam Goddard	216.5	Amend	Supports the specific provision for drive through facilities within the Mixed-Use Zone. Considered that the discretionary activity status proposed is restrictive as this activity is compatible with objectives, policies, and the other activities provided for in the zone	Seeks specific provision for drive through restaurants in the Mixed-Use Zone as a permitted activity.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S5: Building coverage	Anitha Premraj Sam Goddard	216.6	Oppose	Considers activities accommodated within the MUZ include commercial and light industrial activities that may require a site arrangement with a greater level of flexibility than is currently provided in the PDP.	Delete the proposed restrictions on site coverages to provide for greater flexibility in the format of development on the site.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S6: Impervious area	Anitha Premraj Sam Goddard	216.7	Oppose	Considers activities accommodated within the MUZ include commercial and light industrial activities that may require a site arrangement with a greater level of flexibility than is currently provided in the PDP.	Delete the proposed restrictions on site coverages to provide for greater flexibility in the format of development on the site.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S7: Landscaped area	Anitha Premraj Sam Goddard	216.8	Oppose	Considers activities accommodated within the MUZ include commercial and light industrial activities that may require a site arrangement with a greater level of flexibility than is currently provided in the PDP.	Delete the proposed restrictions on site coverages to provide for greater flexibility in the format of development on the site.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Objectives /MUZ-O1: Mixed use of activities	Shravan Miryala	217.19	Support	Supports MUZ-O1	Retain MUZ-O1 as notified.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Objectives /MUZ-O3: Effects on the community and economic function of centres	Shravan Miryala	217.20	Support	Supports MUZ-O3	Retain MUZ-O3 as notified.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Objectives /MUZ-O5: Access and connectivity	Shravan Miryala	217.21	Support	Supports MUZ-O5	Retain MUZ-O5 as notified.	Open Submission

# MUZ - Mixed Use Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Policies /MUZ-P1: Mix of activities	Shravan Miryala	217.22	Amend	Supports the intent to encourage a mix of activities within the Zone. Considers that the amenity of more sensitive activities, such as residential activities (which are enabled in this zone), will be better protected where they have been appropriately designed to manage reverse sensitivity effects where there is an interface with lawfully established non-residential activities. Notes that the relief sought is consistent with design principle 1: The Site of the National medium density design guide (Ministry for the Environment, May 2022) which seeks that current or proposed nearby non-residential activities are identified and that residential development responds to them.	Amend MUZ-P1 as follows:  Encourage a compatible mix of activities within the zone by: a. providing for the operational requirements of light industry whilst ensuring a reasonable level of amenity for sensitive uses within the Mixed Use Zone and adjacent Residential Zones; b. limiting retail and office activity to ensure that the function, role and amenity of the City Centre Zone and other centres are not compromised; c. enabling residential, recreational, and/or community activities outside of identified areas of risk, <del>and</del> d. avoiding new heavy industry activities., <u>and</u> <u>e. managing reverse sensitivity at zone interfaces and the interface between existing non-residential and noise- sensitive activities</u>	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Policies /MUZ-P2: Quality living environments	Shravan Miryala	217.23	Amend	Supports Policy MUZ-P2 and the recognition of the range of activities that can occur appropriately in the Zone, including consideration of the existing environment, however, considers the focus should more appropriately be on achieving the intent of the zone while recognising the existing environment.	Amend Policy MUZ-P2 as follows:  Enable residential developments and conversions of existing buildings in the Mixed Use Zone outside of identified areas of risk while managing development to achieve a reasonable standard of amenity for residents., <u>while recognising the existing environment.</u>	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R16: Service stations, transport depots, drive-through facilities	Shravan Miryala	217.24	Oppose	Notes that service stations encompass both commercial and retail activities, permitted within the city center fringe control area (MUZ-R4), which also allows for industrial activities (MUZ-R12). Despite the range of permitted activities within the zone, submitter considers that service stations being classified as discretionary activities for new developments or alterations to existing ones is overly restrictive. Notes that the mixed use zone provides for a compatible mixture of residential, commercial, light industrial, recreational and/or community activities. Considers that service stations are compatible with a range of other mixed-use activities and function appropriately within a mixed use environment such that a permitted status, subject to appropriate development standards, is the most appropriate outcome for managing land use effects and giving effect to the suite of objectives and policies of this zone.  Notes that part of the Z Terminal site in Ahuriri is zoned MUZ zone and used for a transport depot for which the discretionary activity status is also considered to be unduly restrictive.	Amend rule MUZ-R16 to delete the applicability to service stations and transport depots, and Add a new permitted activity rule for service stations and transport depots where MUZ-S1 to MUZ-S5 and MUZ-S11 to MUZ-S14 are met. Not meeting the standards to default to restricted discretionary activity.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S4: Frontages	Shravan Miryala	217.25	Amend	Notes that standard MUZ-S4 requires that, where a building is not located along the street frontage, a landscape buffer of 2 m in depth must be provided where landscaping is comprised of a mix of trees and plants etc. Considers that in all cases the buildings at service stations (existing, new or alterations to existing) will not be located along the street frontage due to functionality and operational safety needs. Notes that any changes to existing service stations or the south-end of the Terminal will have to consider this standard which is not necessarily currently achieved at the sites identified above in the MUZ. Considers this unachievable for a number of functional requirement reasons, including traffic safety. MU Zoning of the southern part of the Terminal (adjacent to Battery Road), if developed to achieve this standard (particularly the buildings on the frontage), may create an incongruous development when considered in the context of Battery Road, a mainly residential road. Considers that for service station sites incorporating trees into front boundary landscaping is problematic. Seeks to clarify if the 'or' in the following aspect of the Standard is intentional and whether the landscaping could be low planting not requiring only trees, but needs to be a mix.	Amend Standard MUZ-S4 to exclude existing service station sites from meeting these requirements; and to clarify the landscaping requirements through introduction of "or" in the list.	Open Submission

# MUZ - Mixed Use Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S7: Landscaped area	Shravan Miryala	217.26	Amend	Notes that standard MUZ-S7 requires all Landscaped areas to be a minimum of 20% of the net site area. Notes that any changes to existing service stations will have to consider this standard which is not currently achieved at the site identified above in the MUZ. It is unlikely to be achievable for a number of functional requirement reasons, including traffic safety. Opposes the imposition of this standard to existing service stations sites. Acknowledges landscaping up to 20% of the site can enhance the attractiveness of a site and mitigate the effects of the development of the site. Service station sites have a significant number of traffic movements into and out of the site per day and, where movement within and visibility to the forecourt and to signage is critical to a successful and safe operation, the extent to which an existing service station can be landscaped is usually extremely limited. Considers that Small scale changes to an existing service station should therefore not need to be assessed against this standard, where lawfully existing.	Amend Standard MUZ-S7 to exclude existing service station sites from the landscaping requirements. This could be achieved by including the following additional exemption to the standard:  1. Landscaped area must be a minimum of 20% of the net site area.  <u>Except where:</u>  <u>a. the site is utilised by a lawfully established existing service station activity.</u>	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone //	Frank Spencer	223.1	Amend	considers the following:  1. The scale restrictions and adjunct use requirements for commercial, office and retail activities is outdated and does not reflect the potential implied and by the Mixed Use Zone 2. The scale restrictions for Residential care and day care and visitor accommodation and education are outdated and fail to match the potential development demand. 3. Entertainment facilities are restricted activity, but there is no definition of Entertainment facilities. 4. Hospitality is dominant in Ahuriri but is not provided for as a permitted activity. 5. Healthcare ought to be a permitted activity rather than Restricted Discretionary 6. Building coverage should remain at 75% 7. The provision relating to open space for South facing residential developments is a non-sensical provision. 8. Residential outlook provisions need further consideration. 9. Container storage needs to accommodate at least three containers in a vertical stack. 10. Greater clarity around stormwater attenuation and disposal required.	seeks a review to consider more pragmatic provisions	Open Submission



# MUZ - Mixed Use Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R2: Relocated Buildings	Sean Thompson	225.11	Amend	Considers that it is not self-evident from the analysis and rationale in the proposed plan, including in terms of s 32 RMA, why relocated buildings should be classified as non-complying in the NCZ, LCZ, LFRZ, LIZ and GIZ. It is accepted that relocated buildings should be discretionary in the Natural Open Space Zone, and there may be urban design and other considerations applicable to the Town Centre Zone and City Centre Zone which warrant different treatment. Since a 2004 Central Otago Environment Court decision most local authorities in New Zealand have either adopted permitted activity classification for relocated buildings (with no standards) or provided for permitted activity status with prescribed performance standards.	Seeks to amend the Relocated Buildings Activity Rules as follows: a. Provide for relocated buildings as a permitted activity (like MUZ) in all relevant zones, excepting where a specified heritage or conservation or urban design consideration applies; b. For the relocated building rules in all zones, the removal of the requirement to deposit a monitoring fee at the same time as submitting the relocated building report; c. Amending the performance standards in relation to relocated buildings in accordance with the wording in the attached Schedule 1 (which can be found in the attached submission), to provide for: i. modification of the performance timeframes such that relocation on permanent foundation is required within two months, and twelve months is allowed for the completion of all reinstatement works; ii. provision for a pre-inspection report in the same or similar form as found in Schedule 2 (which can be found in the attached submission). iii. For relocated buildings in the Light Industrial Zone and General Industrial Zone, the further amendment of performance standards removing the need for a pre-inspection report and monitoring fee.  Consequential or further relief including to the relevant objectives, policies and provisions of the proposed plan in order to give effect to relief sought.  (The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Objectives /General	Alicia McKinnon	230.5	Support	Supports the proposed objectives and policies for the (MUZ) - Mixed Use Zone (with the emphasis upon redrawing the MUZ on the Planning Maps as per the submission) because they aim to provide for a balance between residential, commercial, light industrial and recreational activities.	Retain the wording of the Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) objectives and policies.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Policies /General	Alicia McKinnon	230.6	Support	Supports the proposed objectives and policies for the Mixed Use Zone (with the emphasis upon redrawing the MUZ on the Planning Maps as per the submission) because they aim to provide for a balance between residential, commercial, light industrial and recreational activities.	Retain the wording of the (MUZ) Mixed Use Zone objectives and policies.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R12: Industrial activity	Alicia McKinnon	230.7	Support	Supports that industrial activity is a permitted activity where the industrial activity is one of the following activities:  a) Light manufacturing and servicing; b) Repair and maintenance services, and c) Warehousing and storage.  Supports the move to greater specify the types of industrial activities which are permitted in the Mixed Use Zone and to have a discretionary rule (MUZ-R12B) where activity status conditions are not met in MUZ-R12A.  The Rules should apply to the proposed amended area of the MUZ as per the submission content concerning the PDP Planning Maps.  This will likely provide for greater abilities to control the types of activities that can enter the Mixed Use Zone, thereby helping to minimise negative effects on residential amenity.	Retain the wording of Rules MUZ-R12A and MUZ-R12B.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R16: Service stations, transport depots, drive-through facilities	Alicia McKinnon	230.8	Support	Considers that service stations, transport depots, drive-through facilities having a discretionary activity status is supported (with the rules also applying to the redrawn proposed MUZ area in the submission) with this provision remaining the same as it is in the Operative District Plan.	Retain the wording of MUZ-R16.	Open Submission

# MUZ - Mixed Use Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S1: Height	Alicia McKinnon	230.10	Amend	There should be no increase to the height rule for the Mixed Use Zone.  The current height rule of 12 metres in the Napier Operative District Plan for the Mixed Use Zone must be retained to ensure amenity values are not further eroded through time.	seeks to amend MUZ-S1 as follows:  Buildings and structure must not exceed <del>24</del> <u>12</u> m in height	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S12: Storage of shipping containers	Alicia McKinnon	230.11	Amend	Shipping containers were previously stored at 85 Battery Road and this activity had significant adverse effects on residential amenity, mainly from the noise generated from moving containers.  Considers that the operating hours for the delivery or movement of shipping containers should be constrained in the Mixed Use Zone.	seeks to amend MUZ-S12 as follows:  1. The outdoor storage (including the repair and distribution) of shipping containers must not exceed a height of 3 m. 2. <u>Operating hours for the delivery or movement of shipping containers are between 8am and 10pm on the same day.</u>	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Objectives /MUZ-O1: Mixed use of activities	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.79	Amend	Amend MUZ-O1 to include educational facilities. As any zone that enables residential activities should provide for schools and day care centres as well to support the residential and commercial catchment.	Seeks to amend MUZ-O1 to include educational facilities:  Mixed use of activities  A mix of compatible residential, commercial, light industrial, recreational and/or community activities, <u>including educational facilities</u> are able to establish and operate.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Policies /MUZ-P1: Mix of activities	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.80	Amend	Amend MUZ-P1 so that educational facilities are explicitly provided for. Any zone that enables residential activities in or around it should provide for schools and day care centres as essential social infrastructure required to support the surrounding residential and commercial catchment.  The changes align with the changes requested on the correlating objective - MUZ-O1	Seeks to amend MUZ-P1 to include educational facilities:  MUZ-P1: Mix of activities  Encourage a compatible mix of activities within the zone by:  a) providing for the operational requirements of light industry whilst ensuring a reasonable level of amenity for sensitive uses within the Mixed Use Zone and adjacent Residential Zones;  b) limiting retail and office activity to ensure that the function, role and amenity of the City Centre Zone and other centres are not compromised;  c) enabling residential, recreational, and/or community activities, <u>including educational facilities</u> outside of identified areas of risk, and  d) avoiding new heavy industry activities.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R8: Day care centres	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.81	Oppose	Opposes MUZ-R8, Day care centres are included within the definition of educational facilities as childcare services. Therefore, this activity status is a duplication of MUZ-R10A which also provides for daycare centres as permitted activity if they have less than 10 people. Recommends this activity status is removed; any daycare centre can apply for the same activity through MUZ-R10A.	Seeks to Delete MUZ-R8.	Open Submission



# MUZ - Mixed Use Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R10: Educational facility	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.82	Amend	<p>Amend MUZ-R10A to provide for educational facilities, such as childcare services for up to 50 students as a permitted activity. states this would better align with the typical sizes of pre-school facilities in either established buildings or in new-builds as well as the Ministry's pre-school license requirements. This also recognises the accepted actual effects of these facilities as established in the Mixed Use Zone.</p> <p>Requests the removal of MUZ-R10A.2 as its intent is achieved by MUZ-R10A.1.</p> <p>The Ministry does not support educational facilities as a discretionary activity where compliance cannot be achieved with the permitted activity standards. Educational facilities should be provided for as a restricted discretionary activity in the Mixed Use Zone as educational facilities are essential pieces of social infrastructure required to support the surrounding residential and commercial activities. Any effects council are concerned about can be well managed through appropriate matters of discretion. The matters of discretion we have proposed have been taken from other chapters in the Plan. However, if council does not support these, the Ministry would appreciate the opportunity to work with council to come to an agreement on these matters of discretion.</p> <p>The Ministry also request the title be changed to 'educational facilities' to be consistent with the rest of the Plan and use a term that is defined in the definitions chapter.</p>	<p>Seeks to amend the title to read educational facilities rather than education facilities.</p> <p>Seeks to amend as follows to provide for educational facilities:</p> <p>MUZ-R10A Educational facility</p> <p>Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The educational facility does not cater for more than <del>ten</del> <u>50</u> students, and</li> <li>2. <del>The total number of people accommodated/catered for on the site by activities MUZ R6 - MUZ R10 is no more than ten (excluding staff).</del></li> </ol> <p>MUZ-R10B</p> <p>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: <u>Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>The matters of discretion are:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Scale, design, layout, setbacks and screening;</u></li> <li>2. <u>Contribution to local community wellbeing;</u></li> </ol>	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /General	Sam Goddard	238.11	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for retail activities in the Mixed-Use Zone (MUZ) but considers that specific provision should be made for supermarkets in the MUZ.	<p>Include specific provision for supermarkets in the Mixed-Use Zone with the following activity statuses:</p> <p>Supermarkets up to 450m<sup>2</sup> - Permitted</p> <p>Supermarkets between 450m<sup>2</sup> and 3,000m<sup>2</sup> - Restricted</p> <p>Discretionary Supermarkets greater than 3,000m<sup>2</sup> - Discretionary</p>	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S5: Building coverage	Sam Goddard	238.12	Oppose	Submitter recognises the need for new developments to provide a sufficient level of amenity for residential uses within the MUZ, however, opposes the types of activities which are accommodated within the MUZ include commercial and light industrial activities that may require a different format. Considers that there are other mechanisms to address infrastructure (stormwater) demands through the provision of detention and retention for example.	Delete the proposed restrictions on the building coverage, impervious area and landscaped area to provide for greater flexibility in the site layout that would better suit the functional requirements of the submitter	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S6: Impervious area	Sam Goddard	238.13	Oppose	Submitter recognises the need for new developments to provide a sufficient level of amenity for residential uses within the MUZ however opposes as the types of activities which are accommodated within the MUZ include commercial and light industrial activities that may require a different format. Considers that there are other mechanisms to address infrastructure (stormwater) demands through the provision of detention and retention for example.	Delete the proposed restrictions on the building coverage, impervious area and landscaped area to provide for greater flexibility in the site layout that would better suit the functional requirements of the submitter.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S7: Landscaped area	Sam Goddard	238.14	Oppose	Opposes as the types of activities which are accommodated within the MUZ include commercial and light industrial activities that may require a different format while recognising the need for new developments to provide a sufficient level of amenity for residential uses within the MUZ. Considers that there are other mechanisms to address infrastructure (stormwater) demands through the provision of detention and retention for example.	Delete the proposed restrictions on the building coverage, impervious area and landscaped area to provide for greater flexibility in the site layout that would better suit the functional requirements of the submitter.	Open Submission

# MUZ - Mixed Use Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Introduction /	Phil Stickney	263.56	Amend	While generally supported, there is a significant volume of text and explanation which does not assist in terms of understanding the intent of the Zone and the key matters that set the scene for the provisions. The result is an introduction which is unwieldy and does not aid in useability or clarity. While the Retail Strategy notes a 200sqm for commercial activities within the zone, that does not appear to be buttressed by market demand and tenancy requirements. The Submitter seeks an increase to 300sqm in this area. That is considered appropriate for redevelopment potential of larger existing MUZ sites.	Re-draft the provisions to focus on salient matters and amend 200sqm to 300sqm.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Issues /General	Phil Stickney	263.57	Amend	While generally supported, there is a significant volume of text and explanation which does not assist in terms of understanding the intent of the Zone and the key matters that set the scene for the provisions. The result is an introduction which is unwieldy and does not aid in useability or clarity. While the Retail Strategy notes a 200sqm for commercial activities within the zone, that does not appear to be buttressed by market demand and tenancy requirements. The Submitter seeks an increase to 300sqm in this area. That is considered appropriate for redevelopment potential of larger existing MUZ sites.	Re-draft the provisions to focus on salient matters and amend 200sqm to 300sqm.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Objectives /General	Phil Stickney	263.58	Amend	While generally supported, there is a significant volume of text and explanation which does not assist in terms of understanding the issues for the Zone and the key matters that set the scene for the provisions. The result is an introduction which is unwieldy and does not aid in useability or clarity.	Re-draft the provisions to focus on salient matters.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R1: New buildings	Phil Stickney	263.59	Oppose	Amend or delete Rule MUZ-R1A as there appears to be no substantive rationale to the inclusion of an alternate standard of 400sqm for a building on a site vs a minimum of 500 for a retail activity on the site. The building coverage and landscape standards, together with the provision of carparking will regulate the built form on the site.	Delete this rule.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R4: Commercial activity - city centre fringe control area	Phil Stickney	263.60	Oppose	Opposes the 150sqm blanket floor area restriction and the limiting of the number of hospitality outlets in Rule MUZ-R4A (2) is considered to be unduly restrictive. It does not correlate to sites of larger scale of the site, the nature of the balance of development on the site and while seeking to manage the vibrancy of the CBD, it has the effect of restricting choice and economic wellbeing opportunities for the community.	Amend the rule to reflect that larger sites can accommodate a greater range of hospitality activities and amend the 150sqm restriction to 250sqm.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R9: Visitor accommodation	Phil Stickney	263.61	Oppose	Amend Rule MUZ-R9 as it significantly limits and places restrictions on visitor accommodation as a Permitted Activity and also defaults any infringing activities to a Discretionary Activity status. This is considered unduly restrictive given the locations of the MUZ and their role in supporting the vibrancy of the CBD by enabling accommodation facilities to establish in bespoke designed buildings within the MUZ. Tourism and accommodation is a key driver of the regional economy, and it is considered that the proposed restrictions are not enabling of these activities in their current form.	Amend the provision to provide for larger scale visitor accommodation as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S8: Open space	Phil Stickney	263.62	Amend	Amend Rule MUZ-S8 as there appear to be editing errors in the standards relating to ground floor outdoor living space requirements. The standards in MUZ-S8 include requirements for roof terraces, balconies but which are captured by the ground floor residential unit requirements. MUZ-S8(3) and (4) is unduly restrictive in respect of setbacks for southern facing yards and will restrict the efficient development of sites within the MUZ.	Amend provision to reflect ground floor standards only. Delete the provisions of MUZ-S8 (3 and 4).	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S10: Minimum residential unit size	Phil Stickney	263.63	Amend	Amend Rule MUZ-S10 in relation to minimum floor areas for units, as with good design it is possible to provide an appropriate living environment that varies from the standards set out.	Amend the minimum floor area standards to: Studio: 35sqm 2- bed: 45 sqm 3- bed: 60 sqm 4- bed: 80 sqm	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Assessment criteria /General	Phil Stickney	263.64	Amend	Amend Assessment Criteria to refine and tighten the consideration of activities and reflect the amendments and changes sought in this submission. In particular, it is not considered reasonably necessary for a Permitted Activity which infringes a standard in The Plan, to fall to automatically being assessed again against the relevant Objectives and Policies of The Plan as part of a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Amend Assessment Criteria and remove the requirement for a restricted discretionary activity to be assessed against the relevant Objectives and Policies of the Plan.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Objectives /MUZ-O6: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Nichola Nicholson	264.1	Support	Supports in principle the efficient provision of infrastructure in order to promote public, active, and multimodal forms of transport as a method to support wellbeing and improved environmental outcomes.	No relief sought. Retain objective as notified (Inferred).	Open Submission

# MUZ - Mixed Use Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Issues /MUZ-I4: Access and connectivity	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.138	Support	Supports I4 as it recognizes the need to integrate land use and transportation planning and the potential for potential traffic conflict. Supports enhancing connectivity for active and public transport, and consideration of function of the transport network.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Objectives /MUZ-O5: Access and connectivity	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.139	Support	Supports O5 as it recognizes the need to integrate land use and transportation planning and the potential for potential traffic conflict. Supports enhancing connectivity for active and public transport, and consideration of function of the transport network.	No specific relief sought	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Policies /MUZ-P4: Access and connectivity	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.140	Support	Supports P4 as it recognizes the need to integrate land use and transportation planning and the potential for potential traffic conflict. We support enhancing connectivity for active and public transport, and consideration of function of the transport network.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.68	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency requires the ability to construct and operate emergency service facilities (i.e., fire stations) in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies. This means new fire stations may be necessary in any zone across the district in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the effects of a fire station can be largely anticipated and, in the most part, do not differ to the effects of many activities that may be anticipated through rural and urban environments.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency requests that emergency service facilities are provided for as permitted activities in the larger, more extensive zones of the district to recognise the critical importance of emergency services to communities. In providing for emergency service facility as a permitted activity would mean that emergency service facilities would be controlled by the subsequent performance standards of each zone (such as height, height in relation to boundary, front yards, building coverage requirements).and the other relevant performance standards in other chapters (i.e., transport) to ensure that any effects are appropriately managed.</p>	<p>Seeks to include new permitted activity as follows:</p> <p><u>xxx-Rx: Emergency service facilities</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status: Permitted</u></p> <p><u>N/A</u></p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.</p>	Open Submission

# MUZ - Mixed Use Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.87	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency's main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</p> <p>SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.</p> <p>In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure and that new connections under the water supply</p>	<p>Seeks to include a new performance standard as follows:</p> <p><u>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</u></p> <p>1. <u>All new developments must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u></p> <p>2. <u>Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p><u>Matter of discretion:</u></p> <p>1. <u>The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to</p>	Open Submission
MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Policies /MUZ-P5: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Alec Duncan	288.134	Support	<p>Supports this policy to the extent that it seeks to ensure sufficient infrastructure provision and/or mitigation measures to meet demand, including consideration of the effects of climate change.</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission