

Submitter Name	Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary
Golden Bay	General / /	180.1	Amend	Submitter provides general overview of the organisation's roles and responsibilities including the operation of a Service Centre at the Port of Napier. Notes that under the PDP, the Napier Service Centre would be in the Special Purpose Zone (PORTZ), subject to various overlays and provisions. Supports Council's plan but is concerned about potential restrictions on its operations highlighting the scope of definitions, stormwater management, transport provisions, coastal environment objectives, light spill, signs, height controls, and site coverage in the Port area. Refer to original submission for full details.	Summary of relief sought provided. Seeks amendments to clarify definitions, exempt Port sites from certain provisions, and improve the work-ability of the PDP. Refer to original submission and proceeding submission points for full details.
Golden Bay	Definitions /Definitions /PORT RELATED ACTIVITIES	180.2	Oppose	Opposes and considers the definition of 'Port-related activity' needs clarification regarding entities beyond Napier Port authority. Notes the submitter's critical operations at the Port involving bulk cement unloading, storage, and loading and operational elements include freight handling, transitional storage, vehicle maneuvering, and ancillary distribution. Considers permitted activity status for 'Port-related activities' is appropriate but requires clarity. Seeks amendment to include activities by entities beyond Napier Port authority for clarity.	Amend definition for 'Port-related activities' to read (in part): 'The use of land and/or buildings by any entity not limited to the Port Napier Authority ...'
Golden Bay	SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Rules Table /SW-R5: Any development of new or redevelopment of existing impervious areas	180.3	Oppose	Considers and disputes the applicability of Rule SW-R5 and Standard SW-1 to PORTZ Zone sites given their proximity to the receiving environment, absence of connection to the wider stormwater network and the low likelihood that they are contributors to flood risk. Considers on-site retention impractical in intensely developed environment and that on-site detention serves no purpose. Notes that impervious surface limits are not imposed for PORTZ Zone, unlike in other regions like in Aucklands Unitary Plan. Notes that the section 32 report gives cursory consideration to specific stormwater management areas, favoring a broad-brush approach. Considers that the blanket imposition of such controls fails to account for the specific characteristics of areas such as the Port. Seeks exemption from Rule SW-R5 and Standard SW-1with respect to sites located in the PORTZ Zone.	Amend Rule SW-R5 and Standard SW-S1 to include (in both instances) the following exemption: 'This rule / standard does not apply to sites located in the PORTZ – Port Zone.'
Golden Bay	SW - Stormwater /SW - Stormwater - Standards Table /SW-S1: Hydraulic mitigation	180.4	Oppose	Considers and disputes the applicability of Rule SW-R5 and Standard SW-S1 to PORTZ Zone sites given their proximity to the receiving environment, absence of connection to the wider stormwater network and the low likelihood that they are contributors to flood risk. Considers on-site retention impractical in intensely developed environment and that on-site detention serves no purpose. Notes that impervious surface limits are not imposed for PORTZ Zone, unlike in other regions like in Aucklands Unitary Plan. Notes that the section 32 report gives cursory consideration to specific stormwater management areas, favoring a broad-brush approach. Considers that the blanket imposition of such controls fails to account for the specific characteristics of areas such as the Port. Seeks exemption from Rule SW-R5 and Standard SW-1with respect to sites located in the PORTZ Zone.	Amend Rule SW-R5 and Standard SW-S1 to include (in both instances) the following exemption: 'This rule / standard does not apply to sites located in the PORTZ – Port Zone.'
Golden Bay	TPT - Transport /General /General	180.5	Oppose	Opposes the entire Transport chapter of the PDP. Considers that Transport provisions should not apply to GB's site and other Port sites lacking direct legal road access including (Lot 1 DP 13666). Breakwater Road is the nearest legal road identified in the PDP's Roading Hierarchy. The vehicle routes about the site are part of the larger parcel of land relating to the Port as a whole (Legal Desc Part Lot 1 DP 20975). Considers that specific TPT Standards TPT-S3, TPT-S4, TPT-S5, TPT-S6, and TPT-S7 do not apply due to their reference to "roads" and "streets." Also considers that that neither TPT-R2 (New or modified vehicle access and crossings onto a state highway or arterial road) nor the remainder of the activity rules (that all require compliance with the above standards) apply. Seeks a review of Transport chapter's application to PORTZ Zone sites and consequential amendments, proposing an exemption for Port sites lacking legal road access	Amend the TPT Chapter to include the following statement: 'The following provisions do not apply to sites located in the PORTZ – Port Zone that do not have direct access to a legal road: [list the resulting provisions]'
Golden Bay	CE - Coastal Environment /General /General	180.6	Oppose	Opposes the entire Chapter. Notes references in CE Chapter policies to the importance and modified nature of the Port, the functional/operational need for a location in the coastal environment, and the impact of existing land uses on natural character in policies and accounting for existing built character in assessment criteria. However considers that these are not reflected in the CE Chapter objectives, and broadly the CE Chapter provisions are strongly oriented towards the preservation and protection of natural character, natural features, coastal values, and indigenous biodiversity. Considers that current CE Chapter provisions do not appropriately give effect to the NZCPS and particularly Policy 9. Greater recognition needs to be given to the highly modified nature of the Port and environs in the CE Chapter objectives. Requests that the CE Chapter objectives are amended to clear that proposals in this location are not to be held to the same values assessment as those in less modified coastal locations. Notes that A cross-reference in the CE Chapter to the provisions of the Port Zone should also be made.	Amend CE Chapter objectives as required to acknowledge the importance and modified nature of the Port, functional/operational need for a location in the coastal environment, and the impact of existing land uses on natural character. Amend the CE Chapter (under the heading 'Other relevant District Plan provisions') to include a cross- reference to the Part 3 PORTZ – Port Zone Chapter provisions.
Golden Bay	LIGHT - Light /LIGHT - Light - Standards Table /LIGHT-S1: Light spill and lighting design	180.7	Oppose	Considers that it is unclear from the table whether light spill and lighting design requirements set out in Standard LIGHT-S1 apply in the PORTZ Zone. Notes that it is assumed that it is not intended that such standards do apply in the PORTZ Zone given the operational needs of this area and that the PORTZ Zone is not mentioned in the left hand column. Supports if assumption is correct but seeks an explicit statement to this effect would provide additional clarity and certainty.	Amend Standard LIGHT-S1 to include the following statement: 'This standard does not apply to sites located in the PORTZ – Port Zone.'

Submitter Name	Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary
Golden Bay	LIGHT - Light /LIGHT - Light - Standards Table /LIGHT-S3 Table 1: Maximum height of light support structures in a zone	180.8	Oppose	Notes that the table indicates that for 'All Special Purpose Zones' the maximum height of light support structures in a zone must not exceed 20m in height, but also states that for the 'Port Zone' no height limit applies. Notes that it is assumed that the second, more specific reference is the correct one, where the PORTZ Zone is concerned. Seeks rearranged table for clarity.	Amend LIGHT-S3 Table 1 by rearranging it to clarify that the 20m height limit only applies in Special Purpose Zones other than those specifically listed (where no height limit applies).
Golden Bay	NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-05: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport	180.9	Support	Supports the more specific wording of the proposed objective and policy (in comparison to the equivalent Operative District Plan provisions)	Retain provisions as notified.
Golden Bay	NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P6: Port noise	180.10	Support	Supports the more specific wording of the proposed objective and policy (in comparison to the equivalent Operative District Plan provisions)	Retain provisions as notified.
Golden Bay	SIGN - Signs /SIGN - Signs - Rules Table /General	180.11	Oppose	<p>Opposes as it is not clear which SIGN rules apply to signs in the PORTZ Zone. Rules SIGN-R1 to SIGN-R8, SIGN-R10 to SIGN-R14, SIGN-R19, SIGN-R21, SIGN-R22, SIGN-R24 and SIGN-R25 specifically to signs in the road reserve, specific parks, certain precincts or zones, on certain buildings or in relation to specific activities, whereas as Rules SIGN- R9, SIGN-R15 to SIGN-R18, SIGN-R20 and SIGN-S23 apply in areas outside those specified. Rule SIGN-R26 acts as a non-complying activity default for signs not otherwise provided for. Notes assumption regarding applicability of Rules SIGN-R15 to SIGN-R18, particularly Rule SIGN-R15 regarding signs on building facades, in the PORTZ Zone. Notes that Standards SIGN-S1, SIGN-S2, and SIGN-S4 are likely applicable due to their reference to "All zones and precincts," but not Standard SIGN-S3, which does not mention the PORTZ Zone. Considers that an absence of any control on sign area in the PORTZ Zone is appropriate, if that is what is intended, submitter would be concerned if signs in the PORTZ Zone fell to non-complying status under Rule SIGN-R26 in the absence of specific references elsewhere.</p> <p>Seeks a review of the application of the SIGN provisions to the PORTZ Zone and make consequential amendments as necessary to clarify which provisions apply. Seeks that any SIGN provisions applying to the PORTZ Zone must reflect the workaday character and amenity of the area. In that context it is noted that, explicitly, no limitation on sign area or combination of signs per site applies in the industrial zone (SIGN-S3). Considers that a similar approach is warranted for the PORTZ Zone.</p>	Review the application of the SIGN provisions to the PORTZ Zone and consequentially amend the SIGN – Signs – Rules Table and SIGN – Signs – Standards Table as appropriate to provide clarity as to their application and so that, as a consequence, a similar approach is adopted as that that applies in industrial zones.
Golden Bay	SIGN - Signs /SIGN - Signs - Standards Table /General	180.12	Oppose	<p>Opposes as it is not clear which SIGN rules apply to signs in the PORTZ Zone. Rules SIGN-R1 to SIGN-R8, SIGN-R10 to SIGN-R14, SIGN-R19, SIGN-R21, SIGN-R22, SIGN-R24 and SIGN-R25 specifically to signs in the road reserve, specific parks, certain precincts or zones, on certain buildings or in relation to specific activities, whereas as Rules SIGN- R9, SIGN-R15 to SIGN-R18, SIGN-R20 and SIGN-S23 apply in areas outside those specified. Rule SIGN-R26 acts as a non-complying activity default for signs not otherwise provided for. Notes assumption regarding applicability of Rules SIGN-R15 to SIGN-R18, particularly Rule SIGN-R15 regarding signs on building facades, in the PORTZ Zone. Notes that Standards SIGN-S1, SIGN-S2, and SIGN-S4 are likely applicable due to their reference to "All zones and precincts," but not Standard SIGN-S3, which does not mention the PORTZ Zone. Considers that an absence of any control on sign area in the PORTZ Zone is appropriate, if that is what is intended, submitter would be concerned if signs in the PORTZ Zone fell to non-complying status under Rule SIGN-R26 in the absence of specific references elsewhere.</p> <p>Seeks a review of the application of the SIGN provisions to the PORTZ Zone and make consequential amendments as necessary to clarify which provisions apply. Seeks that any SIGN provisions applying to the PORTZ Zone must reflect the workaday character and amenity of the area. In that context it is noted that, explicitly, no limitation on sign area or combination of signs per site applies in the industrial zone (SIGN-S3). Considers that a similar approach is warranted for the PORTZ Zone.</p>	Review the application of the SIGN provisions to the PORTZ Zone and consequentially amend the SIGN – Signs – Rules Table and SIGN – Signs – Standards Table as appropriate to provide clarity as to their application and so that, as a consequence, a similar approach is adopted as that that applies in industrial zones.
Golden Bay	PORTZ - Port Zone /Objectives /PORTZ-O1: Provide for Napier PortThe ongoing operation, maintenance, and development of the port is enabled, while managing off-site adverse effects on the environment. Relates to PORTZ-I1 and PORTZ-I2	180.13	Support	Supports the proposed objectives and policies seek to address identified issues with the more generic operative provisions: i.e. that they overlook the unique operational needs of the Napier Port and do not include specific objectives and policies that provide for the nature and scale of the operations ensuring that the Port facilities are not constrained.Supports the more specific wording of the proposed objectives and policies as giving effect to NZCPS Policy 9 and to the Port's status as regionally significant infrastructure.	Retain provisions as notified.
Golden Bay	PORTZ - Port Zone /Objectives /PORTZ-O2: The efficient and effective use and development of Napier Port	180.14	Support	Supports the proposed objectives and policies seek to address identified issues with the more generic operative provisions: i.e. that they overlook the unique operational needs of the Napier Port and do not include specific objectives and policies that provide for the nature and scale of the operations ensuring that the Port facilities are not constrained.Supports the more specific wording of the proposed objectives and policies as giving effect to NZCPS Policy 9 and to the Port's status as regionally significant infrastructure.	Retain provisions as notified.
Golden Bay	PORTZ - Port Zone /Policies /PORTZ-P1: Regional significance of Napier Port	180.15	Support	Supports the proposed objectives and policies seek to address identified issues with the more generic operative provisions: i.e. that they overlook the unique operational needs of the Napier Port and do not include specific objectives and policies that provide for the nature and scale of the operations ensuring that the Port facilities are not constrained. Supports the more specific wording of the proposed objectives and policies as giving effect to NZCPS Policy 9 and to the Port's status as regionally significant infrastructure.	Retain provisions as notified.

Submitter Name	Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary
Golden Bay	PORTZ - Port Zone /Policies /PORTZ-P2: Characteristics of port activities	180.16	Support	Supports the proposed objectives and policies seek to address identified issues with the more generic operative provisions: i.e. that they overlook the unique operational needs of the Napier Port and do not include specific objectives and policies that provide for the nature and scale of the operations ensuring that the Port facilities are not constrained. Supports the more specific wording of the proposed objectives and policies as giving effect to NZCPS Policy 9 and to the Port's status as regionally significant infrastructure.	Retain provisions as notified.
Golden Bay	PORTZ - Port Zone /Policies /PORTZ-P4: Port-related activities	180.17	Support	Supports as the proposed objectives and policies seek to address identified issues with the more generic operative provisions: i.e. that they overlook the unique operational needs of the Napier Port and do not include specific objectives and policies that provide for the nature and scale of the operations ensuring that the Port facilities are not constrained. Supports the more specific wording of the proposed objectives and policies as giving effect to NZCPS Policy 9 and to the Port's status as regionally significant infrastructure.	Retain provisions as notified.
Golden Bay	PORTZ - Port Zone /PORTZ - Port Zone - Rules Table /PORTZ-R4: Port-related industrial activity, transport, storage, and goods handling	180.18	Oppose	<p>Opposes as 'Port-related industrial activity, transport, storage and goods handling' is provided for as a permitted activity in the PORTZ Zone, (with a default to fully discretionary activity in the event of infringements of relevant standards in the PORTZ Zone), however, the term is not defined in the PDP. Considers that the distinction between it and the definition for 'Port-related activity' is not clear. Considers that there is no justification for distinguishing between 'Port-related industrial activity' and general 'Industrial activity', which is defined, in the PORTZ Zone. 'Industrial activity' should be provided for as a permitted activity, enabling the PORTZ objectives and policies and relevant assessment criteria (including 'Whether the activity has an operational requirement to be located in the Port Zone') as notified brought to bear in instances where relevant PORTZ standards are infringed.</p> <p>Considers that it is not clear what activities the Assessment criteria PORTZ- AC5 are intended to apply to. It is not clear whether "Activities that are not directly related to the port activities" encompasses any activities not catered for under Rule PORTZ-R1 alone, or also PORTZ-R2 to PORTZ-R5. Seeks amendment to PORTZ-R4 above, to clarified that PORTZ-AC5 only applies with respect to activities subject to PORTZ-R5.</p>	<p>Amend Rule PORTZ-R4 to read:</p> <p>'PORTZ-R4: Port-related industrial Industrial activity, transport, storage and goods handling'</p>
Golden Bay	PORTZ - Port Zone /Assessment criteria /PORTZ-AC3: Port-related industrial, transport, storage, and goods handling	180.19	Oppose	<p>Opposes as 'Port-related industrial activity, transport, storage and goods handling' is provided for as a permitted activity in the PORTZ Zone, (with a default to fully discretionary activity in the event of infringements of relevant standards in the PORTZ Zone), however, the term is not defined in the PDP. Considers that the distinction between it and the definition for 'Port-related activity' is not clear. Considers that there is no justification for distinguishing between 'Port-related industrial activity' and general 'Industrial activity', which is defined, in the PORTZ Zone. 'Industrial activity' should be provided for as a permitted activity, enabling the PORTZ objectives and policies and relevant assessment criteria (including 'Whether the activity has an operational requirement to be located in the Port Zone') as notified brought to bear in instances where relevant PORTZ standards are infringed.</p> <p>Considers that it is not clear what activities the Assessment criteria PORTZ- AC5 are intended to apply to. It is not clear whether "Activities that are not directly related to the port activities" encompasses any activities not catered for under Rule PORTZ-R1 alone, or also PORTZ-R2 to PORTZ-R5. Seeks amendment to PORTZ-R4 above, to clarified that PORTZ-AC5 only applies with respect to activities subject to PORTZ-R5.</p>	<p>Amend Assessment criteria PORTZ-AC3 to read:</p> <p>'PORTZ-AC3: Port-related industrial Industrial activity, transport, storage and goods handling'</p> <p>Delete Assessment criteria PORTZ-AC3a. relating to: 'Whether the activity has an operational requirement to be located in the Port Zone.'</p>
Golden Bay	PORTZ - Port Zone /Assessment criteria /PORTZ-AC5: Activities that are not directly related to the port activities	180.2	Oppose	<p>Opposes as 'Port-related industrial activity, transport, storage and goods handling' is provided for as a permitted activity in the PORTZ Zone, (with a default to fully discretionary activity in the event of infringements of relevant standards in the PORTZ Zone), however, the term is not defined in the PDP. Considers that the distinction between it and the definition for 'Port-related activity' is not clear. Considers that there is no justification for distinguishing between 'Port-related industrial activity' and general 'Industrial activity', which is defined, in the PORTZ Zone. 'Industrial activity' should be provided for as a permitted activity, enabling the PORTZ objectives and policies and relevant assessment criteria (including 'Whether the activity has an operational requirement to be located in the Port Zone') as notified brought to bear in instances where relevant PORTZ standards are infringed.</p> <p>Considers that it is not clear what activities the Assessment criteria PORTZ- AC5 are intended to apply to. It is not clear whether "Activities that are not directly related to the port activities" encompasses any activities not catered for under Rule PORTZ-R1 alone, or also PORTZ-R2 to PORTZ-R5. Seeks amendment to PORTZ-R4 above, to clarified that PORTZ-AC5 only applies with respect to activities subject to PORTZ-R5.</p>	<p>Amend Assessment criteria PORTZ-AC5 to read:</p> <p>'PORTZ-AC5: Activities that are not directly related to the port activities <u>subject to PORTZ-R5'</u></p>

Submitter Name	Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary
Golden Bay	PORTZ - Port Zone /PORTZ - Port Zone - Standards Table /PORTZ-S2: Height in relation to boundary	180.21	Oppose	Notes that standard PORTZ-S2 aims to maintain character and amenity of areas adjacent to the Port, including residential amenity. Considers that there is an over-extension of the standard's scope by referencing "site boundary" beyond its stated purpose. Considers that the standard does not apply with respect to the submitter's site (Lot 1 DP 13666) Considers that the application of the standard to sites within the PORTZ Zone is questionable given the functional, workaday appearance of the Port, the fact that the standard appears intent on managing the interface with other zones, and the reality that most sites at the Port have no legal road access. Request review and clarification of the rationale for Standard PORTZ-S2 to ensure its application aligns with intended objectives	Amend Standard PORTZ-S2 as follows: '2. No part of a building, structure, outdoor storage, refuse storage area or stockpile or stored goods must project beyond a building envelope constructed by drawing planes along all parts of all zone boundaries, other than the coastal marine area boundary. The planes must commence 7.5 m above ground level at the zone boundary and at any site boundary adjoining a road or designated rail corridor and must be inclined to the horizontal at an angle of 65 degrees. 3. This standard does not apply to lighting poles, quayside cranes, and container cranes <u>or to sites located in the PORTZ – Port Zone that do not have direct access to a legal road.</u> '
Golden Bay	PORTZ - Port Zone /Assessment criteria /PORTZ-AC1: All infringements	180.22	Oppose	Notes that standard PORTZ-S2 aims to maintain character and amenity of areas adjacent to the Port, including residential amenity. Considers that there is an over-extension of the standard's scope by referencing "site boundary" beyond its stated purpose. Considers that the standard does not apply with respect to the submitter's site (Lot 1 DP 13666) Considers that the application of the standard to sites <u>within</u> the PORTZ Zone is questionable given the functional, workaday appearance of the Port, the fact that the standard appears intent on managing the interface with other zones, and the reality that most sites at the Port have no legal road access. Request review and clarification of the rationale for Standard PORTZ-S2 to ensure its application aligns with intended objectives	Amend related matters of discretion and Assessment criteria PORTZ-AC1 to reflect a refocusing of the standard on the management of the PORTZ Zone's external interface and maintenance of the character and amenity of adjoining residential areas.
Golden Bay	PORTZ - Port Zone /PORTZ - Port Zone - Standards Table /PORTZ-S3: Site coverage	180.23	Oppose	Opposes as it is not clear why a limit on site coverage is sought to be imposed in the PORTZ Zone. Notes that the stated purpose of the rule is 'to provide for buildings that are functional and of a sufficient size to provide for a range of port-related activities; to manage the effects of buildings and structures on residential amenity and use of the coastal marine area and open spaces.' Submitter questions the applicability of this standard to sites within PORTZ Zone due to the functional, industrial nature of the Port, its physical separation from residential areas, and the need to maximize space efficiency. Notes that no equivalent limitation on site coverage applies in the GIZ – General Industrial Zone, which exhibits a similar character to the Port. Considers that 100% coverage should be permissible in the circumstances and seeks the deletion of this standard.	Delete Standard PORTZ-S3. Delete associated Assessment criteria in PORTZ- AC1.
Golden Bay	PORTZ - Port Zone /Assessment criteria /PORTZ-AC1: All infringements	180.24	Oppose	Opposes as it is not clear why a limit on site coverage is sought to be imposed in the PORTZ Zone. Notes that the stated purpose of the rule is 'to provide for buildings that are functional and of a sufficient size to provide for a range of port-related activities; to manage the effects of buildings and structures on residential amenity and use of the coastal marine area and open spaces.' Submitter questions the applicability of this standard to sites within PORTZ Zone due to the functional, industrial nature of the Port, its physical separation from residential areas, and the need to maximize space efficiency. Notes that no equivalent limitation on site coverage applies in the GIZ – General Industrial Zone, which exhibits a similar character to the Port. Considers that 100% coverage should be permissible in the circumstances and seeks the deletion of this standard.	Delete Standard PORTZ-S3.Delete associated Assessment criteria in PORTZ- AC1.
Golden Bay	CE - Coastal Environment /Objectives /General	180.25	Oppose	Opposes the entire Chapter. Notes references in CE Chapter policies to the importance and modified nature of the Port, the functional/operational need for a location in the coastal environment, and the impact of existing land uses on natural character in policies and accounting for existing built character in assessment criteria. However considers that these are not reflected in the CE Chapter objectives, and broadly the CE Chapter provisions are strongly oriented towards the preservation and protection of natural character, natural features, coastal values, and indigenous biodiversity. Considers that current CE Chapter provisions do not appropriately give effect to the NZCPS and particularly Policy 9. Greater recognition needs to be given to the highly modified nature of the Port and environs in the CE Chapter objectives. Requests that the CE Chapter objectives are amended to clear that proposals in this location are not to be held to the same values assessment as those in less modified coastal locations. Notes that A cross-reference in the CE Chapter to the provisions of the Port Zone should also be made.	Amend CE Chapter objectives as required to acknowledge the importance and modified nature of the Port, functional/operational need for a location in the coastal environment, and the impact of existing land uses on natural character. Amend the CE Chapter (under the heading 'Other relevant District Plan provisions') to include a cross- reference to the Part 3 PORTZ – Port Zone Chapter provisions.