

| Submitter Name | Section / Sub-section / Provision | Submission number / Point Number | Position | Summary of Submission | Relief Summary |
|--------------------------|--|----------------------------------|----------|--|---|
| Napier BSL No. 3 Limited | General / / | 179.1 | Amend | Summary of matters addressed in other submission points | Seeks a number of amendments throughout the Plan focusing on rules, standards and assessment criteria. |
| Napier BSL No. 3 Limited | MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R1: New buildings | 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 |
| Napier BSL No. 3 Limited | MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table /MUZ-R3: Commercial activity outside the city centre fringe control area | 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: Commercial Activity (<u>including office accommodation and retail activities</u>) outside the city center fringe control area' 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. |
| Napier BSL No. 3 Limited | MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Rules Table / | 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. |
| Napier BSL No. 3 Limited | SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Rules Table /SW-R1: Development of new or redevelopment of existing uncovered car parks | 179.5 | Oppose | The number of car parks should not trigger the need for consent. Requiring resource consent for any carpark more than 10 spaces is an inefficient method to achieve stormwater quality objectives. Further, there are no standards to measure compliance with (2) against. There is no clarity as to what would be an "approved" stormwater management device. | Delete rule. Consider if outcomes are best achieved through the Stormwater Bylaw or Code of Practice rather than a resource consent process. Alternatively, amend the rule to remove the 10 car park trigger for consent and improve clarity on the expected stormwater treatment. |
| Napier BSL No. 3 Limited | SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Rules Table /SW-R2: Development of new or redevelopment of existing roads or state highways | 179.6 | Amend | The current drafting of the rule effectively requires roads designed to accommodate less than 5,000 vehicle per day to seek resource consent under SW-R2B. Further, there are no standards to measure compliance with (2) against. | Delete rule and consider if outcomes are best achieved through the Stormwater Bylaw or Code of Practice. Alternatively, amend rule to improve clarity of when permitted activity conditions would be met. |
| Napier BSL No. 3 Limited | OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R2: Partial demolition of a building or structure on a Contributory site | 179.7 | Amend | Support the approach of allowing limited work as a Permitted Activity but greater certainty of the view shaft from the street is required to enable effective implementation of the Rule. | Amend rule to improve clarity in implementation. |
| Napier BSL No. 3 Limited | OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R3: External additions and alterations to buildings or structures on a Contributory site | 179.8 | Amend | Support the approach of allowing limited work as a Permitted Activity but greater certainty of the view shaft is required to enable effective implementation of the Rule. Further, and what constitutes the 25m2 allowed – gross floor area or vertical area of a façade (just a front façade?). | Seeks that the rule be amended to improve clarity. |
| Napier BSL No. 3 Limited | OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R5: New or relocated buildings or structures not otherwise provided by OVR8-R4 on a Contributory site | 179.9 | Oppose | Greater certainty for landowners needs to be provided. | Delete rule, or alternatively amend to a Controlled activity with non-notification status so it is clear that new buildings are anticipated and enabled on sites within the overlay, however conditions may be applied in terms of design. |
| Napier BSL No. 3 Limited | OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R6: Total demolition or relocation off site of a building or structure on a Contributory site | 179.10 | Oppose | Together with a non-complying activity status noting responding to Policy OVR8-P7, which sets out circumstances when demolition can occur, greater discretion is considered appropriate when considering groups of buildings as opposed to individual buildings. | Amend to a Discretionary status. |
| Napier BSL No. 3 Limited | OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R7: Maintenance and repair of any existing building or structure on a Non-contributory site | 179.11 | Amend | Support the approach of allowing limited work as a Permitted Activity but greater certainty of the view shaft is required to enable effective implementation of the Rule, and what constitutes the 25m2 allowed – gross floor area or vertical area of a façade (just a front façade?) The rule/approach should be more enabling than OVR8-R3A given it applies to non-contributory sites. | Amend |
| Napier BSL No. 3 Limited | OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay /OVR8 - Iron Pot Heritage Overlay - Rules Table /OVR8-R7: Maintenance and repair of any existing building or structure on a Non-contributory site | 179.12 | Oppose | Greater certainty for landowners needs to be provided. | Delete rule, or alternatively amend to a Controlled activity with non-notification status so it is clear that new buildings are anticipated and enabled on sites within the overlay, however conditions may be applied in terms of design. |
| Napier BSL No. 3 Limited | MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S3: Yards | 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. |
| Napier BSL No. 3 Limited | MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S8: Open space | 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. |
| Napier BSL No. 3 Limited | MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S9: Residential Outlook space | 179.15 | Oppose | Seems excessive for when higher density is encouraged. | Amend or delete and place as an Assessment Criteria. |

| Submitter Name | Section / Sub-section / Provision | Submission number / Point Number | Position | Summary of Submission | Relief Summary |
|--------------------------|--|----------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| Napier BSL No. 3 Limited | MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S12: Storage of shipping containers | 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. |
| Napier BSL No. 3 Limited | MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S13: Garages | 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. |
| Napier BSL No. 3 Limited | MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /MUZ - Mixed Use Zone - Standards Table /MUZ-S14: Fences and walls | 179.18 | Amend | The purpose relates only to residential activities but would otherwise apply to every activity. | Amend to apply to only residential activities. |
| Napier BSL No. 3 Limited | SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Standards Table /SW-S1: Hydraulic mitigation | 179.19 | Amend | Significant loss of land and cost for larger development. There needs to be balance between private and public response, and options for when on-site solutions are not a practicable option. Implementation under (5) is not possible without subdivision. | Amend |
| Napier BSL No. 3 Limited | MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Assessment criteria /MUZ-AC1: New buildings not meeting permitted standards (MUZ-R1) | 179.20 | Oppose | Consequential amendment - Not necessary with Rule MUZ-R1 deleted. | Delete |
| Napier BSL No. 3 Limited | MUZ - Mixed Use Zone /Assessment criteria /MUZ-AC1: New buildings not meeting permitted standards (MUZ-R1) | 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. |
| Napier BSL No. 3 Limited | SW - Stormwater /Assessment criteria /SW-AC1: All activities requiring consent in this chapter | 179.22 | Amend | Significant and costly expert assessment would be required to satisfy many of the criteria – increasing resource consenting costs. Too greater / onerous assessment on the wider environment being imposed on individual resource consent applicants. | Review and focus the criteria |