

Submitter Name	Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary
Neil Fenwick	GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table /GRZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary	173.1	Oppose	Opposes as rule GRZ-S2 takes no account of the building and boundary orientation, time of the day, the sun angle and its sun or shading effect on neighbouring properties. Considers that the effect of a building 'mass' is not universal on differing adjacent land as the orientation, time of the day and season will have varying effects on neighbouring properties. Acknowledges consideration of orientation is noted in the Residential Standards Table GRZ – General Residential Zone – Standards Table; GRZ-S11 Outdoor Space, Rule 3, a and b.Considers that Hastings District Council's example of how this is dealt with could be introduced into the Napier City Council's Proposed District Plan as a solution (Appendix 8.0-1 – Method of Determining Recession Planes)	Amend to introduce differing requirements related to the orientation of each boundary - Use HDC as the benchmark for this change.
Neil Fenwick	GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table /GRZ-S8: Fences and walls	173.2	Oppose	Considers that concerns about personal safety outweigh visual dominance. Considers that Low fences potentially aiding urban crime by providing escape routes and that higher fences needed for sound reduction and privacy. Considers that it is an individual's right to protect themselves through appropriate fencing. Notes the proliferation of security cameras indicates citizen concern for safety. Considers that during early housing and suburban development throughout the 1900's the street became an extension of the landowner's property and low fences may have been appropriate then. Society, mobility via vehicles, proliferation of vehicular movements and crime has changed our perception of safety in this respect. Notes disagreement with planners' socially idealistic view and attempt to recreate past perceptions of safety.	Remove the requirement that limits fence heights on the basis on the basis that the Proposed District Plan is endeavouring to control an aspect of design which must remain under the owners' discretion.
Neil Fenwick	GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Rules Table /GRZ-R5: Grazing of livestock	173.3	Oppose	Considers the Activity Status should not be 'Permitted', as of right. Submitter raises the question whether a land owner complying with the net site area of 2000 sq.m. rule can graze livestock in the middle of a Residential Area as a Permitted use, subject to the NCC Animal Control Bylaw 2021.	Delete this use as a 'Permitted Use' as it could be open to abuse. Considers it should be made a Discretionary use.
Neil Fenwick	GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table /GRZ-S11: Outdoor living space	173.4	Oppose	Acknowledges the intent of taking advantage of the land area for the benefit of the ground floor tenant by specifying minimum dimensions of open space. Rule 1, a, b, c and d., however consider it excessive in its requirement when compared with Rule 2, residential units 'above ground'. Notes that, from a designer's perspective, there are design limitations in relation to >2 storey outdoor living spaces. Considers that a reduction of the requirements of Rule 1 (ground floor) more aligned with Rule 2 (above ground) would present a more equitable design solution.	Seeks further consideration for the rule. As written, it necessarily provides a disadvantage to upper level apartments. Considers that If the rule related to ground floor open space is reduced, it could provide an opportunity for densification of the whole of site development.
Neil Fenwick	GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table /GRZ-S10: Windows to the street	173.5	Oppose	Considers that the restriction or otherwise on the percentage of windows facing the street is irrelevant as the design outcome is totally dependent on the orientation and the users access to the exterior. Notes that there are many examples in early residential developments in New Zealand where orientation was adopted from the northern hemisphere, (south facing) or by early design, always oriented to the street which has led to many of our building stock being costly to heat, compromised access to the outside and poor use of the surrounding land. Considers that it would be more beneficial to focus on the above outcomes, rather than prescriptive rules which are inappropriate for the site under consideration.	Delete the rule related to the percentage of windows facing the street because this requirement takes no account of the design outcome which should/must relate to the orientation of the dwelling and the resultant design and planning of the dwelling on the site. Refer to the body of the submission above for detailed examples of how design and orientation can vary the outcome.