

Submitter Name	Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary
Alan Petersen	NOISE - Noise /Introduction	187.1	Amend	Considers Napier city's regionally significant infrastructure includes Hawke's Bay Airport and Napier Port. These activities are situated near residential zones and have operating requirements that make it impracticable for them to internalise their noise effects. Seeks to add the following to paragraph 4 for emphasis. For Port to "fully" internalise their noise effects.	Seeks to add the following to paragraph 4 for emphasis. For Port to "fully" internalise their noise effects.
Alan Petersen	NOISE - Noise /Introduction /	187.2	Amend	Acoustic treatment requirements for noise-sensitive activities in areas affected by the "port noise".	Seeks - Submission 2 - P2 - 3rd bullet point 'acoustic treatment requirements for noise-sensitive activities in areas affected by "port noise" '. Make it more specific to noise.
Alan Petersen	NOISE - Noise /Introduction /	187.3	Amend	limits on vibration generated by construction activities to protect buildings and to limit disruption to people and businesses; Submission 3 – P2 – last bullet point. Disruption to normal recreational rest and business activities. This should include for outdoor living space as defined in the Definitions Section including in PREC3 – the Napier Hill Mataruahou Amenity Precinct. An outdoor living space "means an area of open space for the use of the occupants of the residential unit or units to which the space is allocated". In reality it is treated like an outside room for quiet and peacefulness not to be impacted by disturbance including adverse noise effects.	Submission 3 – P2 – last bullet point. Disruption to normal recreational rest and business activities. This should include for outdoor living space as defined in the Definitions Section including in PREC3 – the Napier Hill Mataruahou Amenity Precinct. An outdoor living space "means an area of open space for the use of the occupants of the residential unit or units to which the space is allocated". In reality it is treated like an outside room for quiet and peacefulness not to be impacted by disturbance including adverse noise effects.
Alan Petersen	NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-I2: Noise generation can detract from amenity values	187.4	Oppose	Submission 4 - P3 – NOISE I2 - The degree of quiet or peacefulness in an area contributes to the amenity values appreciated by its occupants. Noise from the Port means this is simply not achievable. It cannot be avoided and can only be mitigated to a certain extent and the allowable noise levels are still too high to meet the normal expectations of quiet and peacefulness in a residential area.	Submission 4 - P3 – NOISE I2 - The degree of quiet or peacefulness in an area contributes to the amenity values appreciated by its occupants. Noise from the Port means this is simply not achievable. It cannot be avoided and can only be mitigated to a certain extent and the allowable noise levels are still too high to meet the normal expectations of quiet and peacefulness in a residential area.
Alan Petersen	NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-I3: Noise-sensitive activities can impact on the operation of noise-generating activities	187.5	Amend	Submission 5 – P3 – Noise I3 - In the Port Noise Zones this is not reasonable or practicable.	Seeks to change "not reasonable" to "not possible".
Alan Petersen	NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-I6: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport noise	187.6	Amend	Regionally significant infrastructure, such as Hawke's Bay Airport and Napier Port, is situated near residential zones and has operating requirements that prevent it from fully internalising its noise effects.	Seeks to amend, Submission 6 - P4 – NOISE - I6 - First line "is" should be "are".
Alan Petersen	NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-I6: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport noise	187.7	Amend	Despite adopting all practicable options to internalise noise, the port may, at times, generate a level of noise outside its zone boundary that is greater than would otherwise be expected in adjacent zones. Residents overlooking or near to Napier Port should be aware that the level of effects may be higher than experienced in other residential areas of the city and in some cases at a level that would normally be incompatible with traditional residential activity. Special noise standards and a noise management plan are appropriate, permitting the port to operate while recognising and mitigating its adverse effects on nearby noise-sensitive activities.	Amend Submission 7 - Second paragraph – Add that it should be noted the noise sensitive activities, including the residential areas within the current noise boundaries, were largely in place before the Port was established in its current location.
Alan Petersen	NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing	187.8	Amend	Submission 8 – P 5 - NOISE - O1 - Agreed. But this should include outdoor living spaces during the day and at night – especially in evenings.	Amend to include outdoor living spaces during the day and at night – especially in evenings.
Alan Petersen	NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O5: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport	187.9	Amend	Submission 9 – P5 - Noise – O5 – Agreed – but the Port Noise limits are too high and therefore fail to achieve this objective.	Submission 9 – P5 - Noise – O5 – Agreed – but the Port Noise limits are too high and therefore fail to achieve this objective.
Alan Petersen	NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P2: Noise-sensitive activities	187.10	Amend	Enable the functional operation of noise sensitive activities by: a. preventing noise sensitive activities from establishing in inappropriate locations; b. preventing high noise-generating activities other than roads and railway lines from establishing in residential zones, and c. where noise-sensitive activities establish in areas exposed to high noise-generating activities, require the acoustic treatment to achieve an appropriate internal noise level to enable uninterrupted sleep at night and an internal environment for uses that do not involve overnight accommodation that protects people from unreasonable noise.	Submission 10 – P5 - NOISE – P2 - c. This should also include outdoor living spaces during the day and at night – especially in the evenings. It's an interesting conundrum that residents that live there are expected to tolerate the noise, but visitors are not and therefore are not allowed to be accommodated!
Alan Petersen	NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P6: Port noise	187.11	Amend	Submission 11 – P6 - NOISE P6 – Add d. If noise cannot be avoided or fully mitigated and breaches the levels for internal or outdoor living spaces, then the Port shall pay the affected persons with the Port Noise areas suitable compensation. This to be determined by a valuer & other experts to design a fair & reasonable formula. After all it is consistent with the polluter pays principal. Refer attached report "Port Noise Proposals in the Napier District Plan Review" (the updated version 11/12/2023).	Add d. If noise cannot be avoided or fully mitigated and breaches the levels for internal or outdoor living spaces, then the Port shall pay the affected persons with the Port Noise areas suitable compensation. This to be determined by a valuer & other experts to design a fair & reasonable formula. After all it is consistent with the polluter pays principal.
Alan Petersen	NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration	187.12		Time Period Maximum noise levels LAeq (dB) 6.00 p.m. - 7.30 a.m. 80	Submission 12 – P8 - Noise R2A - point 3 - Why is noise between 6.00PM – 7.30am (i.e. night-time) at 80 LAeq (dB) and daytime is lower at 75. Correct this possible anomaly.
Alan Petersen	NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R12: New or altered noise sensitive activity within the Port Noise Overlay	187.13		1. Aan acoustic design report must be provided to the Council prior to any application for building consent or, where no building consent is required, prior to the commencement of the use. The acoustic design report must be prepared by a person qualified and experienced in acoustics. The report is to indicate the means by which the noise limits specified in this rule will be complied with and is to contain a certificate by its author that the means given therein will be adequate to ensure compliance with the noise limits specified in this rule.	Submission 13 - P20 – NOISE – R12A – point 3 – Typo – "Aan" should be "An".

Submitter Name	Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary
Alan Petersen	NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R12: New or altered noise sensitive activity within the Port Noise Overlay	187.14	Amend	Building Element Wall Requirement 1. 20 mm timber weather boards exterior cladding. Internal lining two layers of 10 mm thick gypsum plasterboard. Minimum 75 mm thick fibreglass or polyester or wool insulation in wall cavity. 2. Brick veneer. Internal lining 1 layer of 10 mm thick gypsum plasterboard.	Submission 14 - P21 – A physicist engineer who redeveloped the Farmers building in Auckland Hobson St into apartments found after much testing that having a party wall made of two panels with an 150mm airgap was the most effective way to prevent noise transmission from one side to the other. Therefore allow other methods.
Alan Petersen	NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R12: New or altered noise sensitive activity within the Port Noise Overlay	187.15	Oppose	Floor 1. On grade slab. 2. Two layers of 20 mm thick particle board	Submission 15 - P22 - 4. Add for other flooring systems that meet the insulation standards (that I have worked on). Don't just specify particle board – a very sub-standard product.
Alan Petersen	NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table / NOISE-S3: General noise limits within the Port Zone	187.16	Oppose	Submission 16 - P29 & 30 – NOISE – S3: General noise limits within the Port Zone & S4 – Noise limits for container repair and maintenance within the Port Zone. The time over any consecutive five-day period at 65dB. This simply not fair. This averaging means any noise above this which happens intermittently at any time over a 5-day period is considered to be acceptable because the 5-day averaging is always results in a lower noise level. If retained the limit should be 60dB. It is my understanding that no other noise rule in the Proposed District Plan has this averaging rule. All the other noise limits should be lowered by 5. If the noise levels remain as they are the Port should do more acoustic treatment at their full cost on affected dwellings in the Port Noise Zones and pay appropriate compensation to residents.	If the noise levels remain as they are the Port should do more acoustic treatment at their full cost on affected dwellings in the Port Noise Zones and pay appropriate compensation to residents.
Alan Petersen	NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /NOISE-AC1: General assessment criteria for activities generating noise and/or vibration	187.17	Amend	Submission 17 - P32 – NOISE-AC1: General assessment criteria for activities generating noise and/or vibration – Public health – a – add iv – quiet enjoyment of outdoor living spaces.	Relief Sought is not included.
Alan Petersen	NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /NOISE-AC7: New or altered noise sensitive activity within the Port Noise Overlay (NOISE-R11)	187.18	Amend	Submission 18 - P34 – NOISE – AC7: - New or altered noise sensitive activity within the Port Noise Overlay (NOISE – R11). Include “quiet enjoyment of outdoor living spaces”.	Seeks to include “quiet enjoyment of outdoor living spaces”.
Alan Petersen	NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /NOISE-AC8: New noise sensitive activity within the Port Zone (NOISE-R12)	187.19	Amend	Submission 19 - P34 – NOISE –AC8: New noise sensitive activity within the Port Noise Overlay (NOISE – R12). Include “quiet enjoyment of outdoor living spaces”.	Seeks to include “quiet enjoyment of outdoor living spaces”.
Alan Petersen	APPS (a) - Port Noise Management Plan /Minimum port noise management plan provisions /	187.20	Amend	Submission 20 – p1 – 1. d. Procedures for recommendation of the Port Noise Liaison Committee to be considered and determined by the Port Operator. This is not acceptable. The Port Noise Liaison Committee is a collaborative body. The procedures for recommendations should be done by the Committee.	The procedures for recommendations should be done by the Committee.
Alan Petersen	APPS (a) - Port Noise Management Plan /Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements /	187.21	Amend	a. The Port Operator shall maintain at its expense permanent sound level monitoring equipment operating 24 hours a day 7 days a week and shall arrange for a suitably qualified person to perform continuous monitoring of noise emanating from port activities to ensure that the provisions specified in NOISE-S3 are complied with. The monitoring equipment shall as a minimum record noise level statistics in 15-minute periods so that the Leq, Lmax and L90 can be determined for each 15-minute period. In addition, the monitoring equipment shall be capable of recording the actual sound when a pre-set threshold or set of thresholds is exceeded, so that the sound can be listened to at a later time. All recorded data shall be kept for a minimum of six months, and be available if requested by Napier City Council . Submission 21 – p1 – 2. a. last sentence - --requested by Napier City Council or others on the Port Noise Liaison Committee.	Submission 21 – p1 – 2. a. last sentence - --requested by Napier City Council or others on the Port Noise Liaison Committee.
Alan Petersen	APPS (a) - Port Noise Management Plan /Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Requirements /	187.22	Amend	Submission 22 – at the appropriate sub-paragraph “a” to “l” allow for members of the Port Noise Liaison Committee to obtain noise recordings from the monitoring station(s).	At the appropriate sub-paragraph “a” to “l” allow for members of the Port Noise Liaison Committee to obtain noise recordings from the monitoring station(s).
Alan Petersen	APPS (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Offers of Acoustic Treatment 65 dB L dn (5-day) - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being 65 L dn (5-day) /	187.23	Amend	c. The Port Operator shall contribute 100% of the cost of necessary acoustic treatment to doors and windows (stage 1), installation of mechanical ventilation and cooling (stage 2), re-instatement of painting and decorating disturbed by improvements (stage 1 and 2), and further facade improvements required to achieve the indoor design sound level (stage 3). Submission 23 – 1. c – does installation include the purchase of the mechanical ventilation and cooling unit. If not, it should.	Submission 23 – 1. c – does installation include the purchase of the mechanical ventilation and cooling unit. If not, it should.
Alan Petersen	APPS (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Offers of Acoustic Treatment - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 60 L dn (5-day) and 65 L dn (5-day) /	187.24	Amend	c. The Port Operator shall contribute 100% of the cost of necessary acoustic treatment to doors and windows (stage 1), installation of mechanical ventilation and cooling (stage 2), and reinstatement of painting and decorating disturbed by improvements (stage 1 and 2) provided that the total Port Operator contribution shall not exceed \$50,000 including GST (adjusted annually thereafter (indexed from 1 July 2024) using the Consumers Price Index to compensate for inflation.	Submission 24 – 2. c – does installation include the purchase of the mechanical ventilation and cooling unit. If not, it should.

Submitter Name	Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary
Alan Petersen	APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Offers of Acoustic Treatment - Noise Sensitive Activities shown on the Current Port Noise Contour Map as being between 60 L dn (5-day) and 65 L dn (5-day) /	187.25	Amend	c. The Port Operator shall contribute 100% of the cost of necessary acoustic treatment to doors and windows (stage 1), installation of mechanical ventilation and cooling (stage 2), and reinstatement of painting and decorating disturbed by improvements (stage 1 and 2) provided that the total Port Operator contribution shall not exceed \$50,000 including GST (adjusted annually thereafter (indexed from 1 July 2024) using the Consumers Price Index to compensate for inflation. d. The Port Operator / noise-sensitive activity shall both contribute 50% each of the cost of further facade improvements required to achieve the indoor design sound level (stage 3) provided that the total Port Operator contribution shall not exceed \$50,000 including GST (adjusted annually thereafter (indexed from 1 July 2024) using the Consumers Price Index to compensate for inflation.	Submission 25 – 2.c. & d. The inflation adjustment should be based on the Construction Price Index – not the Consumers Price Index. The acoustic treatment is a construction activity.
Alan Petersen	APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Obligations of the Port Operator /	187.26	Amend	Budget – the amount should be \$250,000 per year plus the Construction Index from the date of the Environment Court decision that set this amount. The Port should be required to provide this amount until all acoustic treatment work is completed.	Budget – the amount should be \$250,000 per year plus the Construction Index from the date of the Environment Court decision that set this amount. The Port should be required to provide this amount until all acoustic treatment work is completed.
Alan Petersen	APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Obligations of the Port Operator /	187.27	Amend	Is the acoustic certificate to NCC a Building Act requirement? The property owners may require a Code Compliance Certificate. At a recent meeting of the Port Liaison Committee this was discussed as many houses as possible that have had acoustic treatment have not had the work completed to enable a Code Compliance Certificate to be issued by Council. This matter needs clarifying.	Relief Sought is not included.
Alan Petersen	APP5 (b) - Port Noise Mitigation Requirements /Obligations of the Property Owner /	187.28	Amend	Obligations of the Property Owner Submission 28 – “4” should be “5”. 5 c & d. Why 50% contribution for Stage 1 to & 3. The Port as the noise creator should be contributing 100% on all mitigation work.	Obligations of the Property Owner Submission 28 – “4” should be “5”. 5 c & d. Why 50% contribution for Stage 1 to & 3. The Port as the noise creator should be contributing 100% on all mitigation work.
Alan Petersen	APP5 (c) Port Noise Liaison Committee /APP5 (c) Port Noise Liaison Committee /General	187.29	Amend	Submission 28 – Somewhere in this section there should be a quorum noted.	Submission 28 – Somewhere in this section there should be a quorum noted.
Alan Petersen	APP5 (c) Port Noise Liaison Committee /APP5 (c) Port Noise Liaison Committee /	187.30	Amend	Submission 29 - Para a. – The Port Operator shall also provide an independent Chairman.	Submission 29 - Para a. – The Port Operator shall also provide an independent Chairman.
Alan Petersen	APP5 (c) Port Noise Liaison Committee /Resourcing /	187.31	Amend	Submission 30 – That the residents on the Port Liaison Committee be paid for their attendance at the same rate as NCC or HBRC members	Submission 30 – That the residents on the Port Liaison Committee be paid for their attendance at the same rate as NCC or HBRC members
Alan Petersen	PORTZ - Port Zone /Introduction	187.32	Amend	The land area is largely reclaimed from the sea. The activities at the port cross the boundary of the Coastal Marine Area (CMA) and good connections to major land transport routes by road and rail are essential. Port activities have unique characteristics, with adverse effects on surrounding areas that include visual, noise, and transport effects, <u>and light spill</u> .	Submission 31 - 4th paragraph – add light spill.
Alan Petersen	PORTZ - Port Zone /Issues /PORTZ-I1: Regional significance of Napier Port	187.33	Amend	Submission 32 – Add to the regional “and from further afield” --.	Add to the regional “and from further afield” --.
Alan Petersen	PORTZ - Port Zone /Issues /PORTZ-I2: Amenity values in the surrounding environment	187.34	Amend	Submission 33 – Has the Port on its current site been there since 1880s? I understand the current site was established after the 1931 Earthquake. Please amend to the correct year. Also add that the residential environment was established in the 1860s. It could have been even earlier.	Submission 33 – Has the Port on its current site been there since 1880s? I understand the current site was established after the 1931 Earthquake. Please amend to the correct year. Also add that the residential environment was established in the 1860s. It could have been even earlier.
Alan Petersen	PORTZ - Port Zone /Assessment criteria /PORTZ-AC1: All infringements	187.35	Support	Support all the assessment matters where any development must consider the neighbouring areas – including residential and recreational.	Support all the assessment matters where any development must consider the neighbouring areas – including residential and recreational.
Alan Petersen	PORTZ - Port Zone /Assessment criteria /PORTZ-AC5: Activities that are not directly related to the port activities	187.36	Oppose	Its interesting that the road & rail networks between the Port site and the residential environment have much lower noise limits than the Port is proposing.	Its interesting that the road & rail networks between the Port site and the residential environment have much lower noise limits than the Port is proposing.
Alan Petersen	PORTZ - Port Zone /Assessment criteria /PORTZ-AC1: All infringements	187.37	Amend	Light spill for all commercial, industrial, and Rural Zones and Precincts – Agree with item c. in regard to residential activities. The Port needs to ensure light spill is minimised on residential areas in the Port Noise Zones.	Light spill for all commercial, industrial, and Rural Zones and Precincts – Agree with item c. in regard to residential activities. The Port needs to ensure light spill is minimised on residential areas in the Port Noise Zones.
Alan Keith Petersen	CE - Coastal Environment /Introduction /General	271.1	Amend	Second paragraph – Typo “plan/s” Remove slash.	Seeks that typo in second paragraph be corrected: "plan/s" - remove slash.
Alan Keith Petersen	CE - Coastal Environment /Issues /CE-I6: Effects of climate change on the coastal environment	271.2	Amend	Considers that it should be included that: the coastal environment along Napier’s coastline (and nearby land & the seabed) was uplifted by 1.6m to 2m by the 1931 Earthquake. This means the uplifted gravel barrier from Westshore to the north end of Bay View is safe from erosion for at least 100 years provided nourishment at Westshore is continued.	Amend CE-I6 by inserting the following: <u>The coastal environment along Napier’s coastline (and nearby land & the seabed) was uplifted by 1.6m to 2m by the 1931 Earthquake.</u>
Alan Keith Petersen	CE - Coastal Environment /Policies /CE-P1: Identify and protect the natural features and natural character of the coastal environment	271.3	Amend	Considers that CE – P1 Bullet point - “An exposed gravel foreshore with a shingle beach” should be amended to reflect the definition of the Napier coastline, the technical term used by a geomorphologist (Jim Dahm), as a “raised gravel barrier”.	Amend CE-P1 character of the coastal environment in Napier as follows: An exposed gravel foreshore <u>raised gravel barrier</u> with a shingle beach; (Inferred relief requested)

Submitter Name	Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary
Alan Petersen	NH - Natural Hazards /NH - Natural Hazards /General	272.1	Amend	Considers with regards to the NH – Natural Hazards Section that it is of concern that on the last day of lodging submissions on the Proposed District Plan that in HB Today is an article “Coastal flood maps affect thousands of properties”. This will impact on many sections of the PDP. But one aspect is to include minimum habitable floor levels in the rules of those areas identified as having flooding risks.	Seeks the following amendments: Submission 1 – That minimum habitable floor levels be introduced for flood risk areas into the rules of the PDP. That this be 0.5m above the minimum ground levels. Submission 2 – Make all other amendments to the sections in the PDP – Introductions, Issues, Objectives, Policies, Rules, Standards and Assessment criteria - that are required to implement the matters arising from the “Coastal flood maps”.
Alan Petersen	PREC3 - Napier Hill Mataruahou Amenity Precinct /PREC3 - Napier Hill / Mataruahou Amenity Precinct /General	272.2	Amend	Considers that where carparking on a steep site is a constraining issue, or overly expensive to build, that a rule be added to PREC3 or in the Code of Practice, that allows carparking to be provided on the street in certain circumstances.	Seeks for a rule to be added to PREC3 or in the code of practice that allows carparking to be provided on the street in certain circumstances.
Alan Petersen	GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential /General	272.3	Amend	Considers that a Bay View Amenity Precinct should be added. Submission 4 - That the Bay View urban areas be zoned GRZ. But its distinct character be recognised by a Precinct overlay as outlined in relief sought (similar to Napier Hill). The overlay of a Precinct zone in the GRZ allows for adjustment to the GRZ that recognises the distinct character of an urban/residential area in Napier City.	Seeks to add a Precinct for Bay View (with an underlying GRZ - General Residential Zone) with the following Policies: <u>PRECXX-P1: Identify and map the features that make up the amenity character of the Bay View Amenity Precinct</u> <u>Identify the key components that contribute to the amenity values and character of the Bay View Amenity Precinct, including:</u> <u>a. section size and configuration and residential density;</u> <u>b. topography and roading layout;</u> <u>c. vegetation coverage and open space, and</u> <u>d. position of houses on the section.</u> <u>PRECXX-P2: Character and amenity values</u> <u>Manage development to maintain the identified character and amenity values of the Bay View Amenity Precinct, including by:</u> <u>a. providing for a generally lower density and intensity of development than the General Residential Zone with 600m2 minimum lot area and 1500m2 for unserviced sites.</u> <u>b. providing for a higher proportion of open space and landscaped area than the General Residential Zone.</u> <u>c. requiring developments for multiple residential units to respond to the identified character and amenity values of the Bay View Amenity Precinct, and</u> <u>d. requiring appropriate infrastructure is in place to support new development and mitigate potential effects.</u> (Inferred relief requested)
Alan Keith Petersen	Planning Maps /General /General	281.1	Oppose	The site is a long narrow strip of 1.4km & 60 to 70m wide. The site is surrounded on three sides by urban development. The property has never been utilised for productive purposes, it is in the Coastal Environment therefore often subject to salt spray which will affect many rural activities such as orcharding. The property is subject to a coastal hazard zone determined by the Environmental Court in 2006. A coastal scientist has recently determined that this part of the coast has not been subject to erosion for about 50 years. The site is not in any flood maps.	Seeks that the property at 68 Franklin Road be rezoned to Rural Lifestyle.
Alan Keith Petersen	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Introduction	281.2	Oppose	Considers there is a clear delineation between rural and residential environments in Bay View, and has been for years. There has been some minor residential development at the ends of Rogers Rd and Franklin Road in recently times.	Seeks to retain the minimum lot size at 1500m2 for non-serviced sites and 800m2 for services sites in the Rural Lifestyle Zone.
Alan Keith Petersen	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Policies /RLZ-P3: Allow adequate support services and infrastructure where appropriate	281.3	Oppose	Considers that a minimum lot size of 800m2 for serviced sites in Bay View and 1500m2 for unserviced sites in Bay View should be retained in the Rural Lifestyle Zone. Considers that additional development at 68 Franklin Road could not be considered urban sprawl. Considers that infrastructure should be improved for urban areas of Bay View. Seeks consistency of terminology between urban living and suburban living.	In the Bay View urban areas retain the minimum lot sizes to 1500m2 for non- serviced sites and 800m2 for serviced sites in the Rural Lifestyle Zone.
Alan Keith Petersen	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Issues /RLZ-I1: Inappropriately located rural lifestyle development can result in the irreversible loss of highly productive land and versatile soil	281.4	Oppose	At Bay View there has been very little development of inappropriate lifestyle development encroaching on highly productive versatile land. Bay View is located in close proximity to Napier and should therefore be seen as part of Napier.	The Bay View urban areas retain the minimum lot sizes to 1500m2 for non- serviced sites and 800m2 for serviced sites in the Rural Lifestyle Zone.
Alan Keith Petersen	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Issues /RLZ-I2: Cost and capacity of infrastructure	281.5	Oppose	Considers the reason for retaining Bay View within a rural environment is due to lack of infrastructure (wastewater). The majority of Bay View is connected to the wastewater network with the exception of approximately 300 homes. Council needs to remedy this.	Seeks to retain the minimum lot sizes to 1500m2 for non- serviced sites and 800m2 for serviced sites in the Rural Lifestyle Zone..

Submitter Name	Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary
Alan Keith Petersen	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Issues /RLZ-I3: The potential for reverse sensitivity in rural environments	281.6	Oppose	Considers reverse sensitivity is two-way. If the site at 68 Franklin Rd is used for rural land uses (as is permitted) the reverse sensitivity could be significant on existing residential properties. When the residential development proceeds there will not be any reverse sensitivity from those typical of rural activities. There is also separation of 20m wide of the rail corridor along the western side of the site.	Seeks to retain the minimum lot sizes to 1500m2 for non- serviced sites and 800m2 for serviced sites in the Rural Lifestyle Zone.
Alan Keith Petersen	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Objectives /RLZ-O1: Choice of residential lifestyle living	281.7	Oppose	Considers the Bay View residential environment is very similar to Westshore - which is the Northern Residential Zone in the Operative Plan & in the Proposed Plan to be in the General Residential Zone.	Seeks the retention of minimum lot sizes to 1500m2 for non- serviced sites and 800m2 for serviced sites in the Rural Lifestyle Zone of Bay View.
Alan Keith Petersen	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Objectives /RLZ-O2: Inappropriate subdivision, use, and development	281.8	Oppose	The residential development with an approved resource consent at 68 Franklin Rd was an appropriate development between 2008 and 2018 and in the recently lodged re-application.	Seeks the retention of minimum lot sizes to 1500m2 for non- serviced sites and 800m2 for serviced sites in the Rural Lifestyle Zone in Bay View.
Alan Keith Petersen	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Objectives /RLZ-O3: Rural character and amenity	281.9	Oppose	The proposed development at 68 Franklin Road is not in a rural environment, but is in an urban and coastal environment.	Seeks to retain the minimum lot sizes to 1500m2 for non- serviced sites and 800m2 for serviced sites in the Rural Lifestyle Zone in Bay View.
Alan Keith Petersen	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Objectives /RLZ-O4: Services and infrastructure	281.10	Oppose	The proposed development at 68 Franklin Road will be supported by adequate servicing infrastructure to the standard required in residential zones.	Seeks to retain the minimum lot sizes to 1500m2 for non- serviced sites and 800m2 for serviced sites in the Rural Lifestyle Zone in Bay View.
Alan Keith Petersen	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Objectives /RLZ-O5: Lifestyle lot sizes maintain rural outlook	281.11	Oppose	Considers that the change in zoning from Rural Settlement Zone to Rural Lifestyle Zone for urban areas of Bay View, and the accompanying change in minimum lot size from 800m2 for serviced sites and 1500m2 for unserviced sites to a proposed minimum lot size of 2500m2 will be a major concern for residents.	Seeks to retain the minimum lot sizes to 1500m2 for non- serviced sites and 800m2 for serviced sites in the Rural Lifestyle Zone in the urban areas of Bay View.
Alan Keith Petersen	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Policies /RLZ-P3: Allow adequate support services and infrastructure where appropriate	281.12	Oppose	Infrastructure in Bay View needs to be upgraded. A lack of infrastructure shouldn't be the primary reason for not giving an area appropriate zoning. There needs to be consistent use of terminology, for example 'urban living' and suburban' are both used.	Seeks to retain the standards table from the Rural Settlement Zone.
Alan Keith Petersen	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Policies /RLZ-P4: Manage development in the Rural Lifestyle Zone	281.13	Oppose	The Bay View residential areas are already an urban environment. Nor will it reduce the productive capacity of highly productive land. Nor would it diminish the list of points "a" to "l" (p4).	Seeks to retain the Standards table from the Rural Settlement Zone.
Alan Keith Petersen	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Policies /RLZ-P6: Cumulative effects	281.14	Oppose	The Bay View residential areas are already an urban environment. Nor will it reduce the productive capacity of highly productive land. Nor would it diminish the list of points "a" to "l" (p4).	Seeks to retain the Standards Table from the Rural Settlement Zone.
Alan Keith Petersen	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Policies /RLZ-P5: Reverse sensitivity	281.15	Oppose	Considers reverse sensitivity is two-way. If the site at 68 Franklin Rd is used for rural land uses (as is permitted) the reverse sensitivity could be significant on existing residential properties. When the residential development proceeds there will not be any reverse sensitivity from those typical of rural activities. There is also separation of 20m wide of the rail corridor along the western side of the site.	Seeks to retain the Standards Table from the Rural Settlement Zone.
Alan Keith Petersen	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Rules Table /RLZ-R3: Residential activities	281.16	Oppose	Considers reverse sensitivity is two-way. If the site at 68 Franklin Rd is used for rural land uses (as is permitted) the reverse sensitivity could be significant on existing residential properties. When the residential development proceeds there will not be any reverse sensitivity from those typical of rural activities. There is also separation of 20m wide of the rail corridor along the western side of the site.	Seeks to retain the same Standards Table from the Rural Settlement Zone.
Alan Keith Petersen	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone - Standards Table /RLZ-S1: Density	281.17	Oppose	In the Bay View urban area density, yards, setback from highly productive land, setback from land- based primary production, setback from water, open drains, and stopbanks height, building coverage, fencing, aerals, lines and support structures, shelterbelts and plantations should all remain the same as the operative Rural Settlement Zone.	Seeks to retain the Standards Table from the Rural Settlement Zone.
Alan Keith Petersen	RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone /Assessment criteria - Rural Lifestyle Zone /General	281.18	Oppose	These criteria are all proposed for the Rural Lifestyle Zone but are not suitable for a residential environment such as the Bay View urban areas. The areas of Bay View zoned Rural Settlement Zone in the PDP but are zoned Rural Settlement in the OPD, should be rezoned General Residential. The Bay View residential area is clearly not rural but urban or residential in nature. The site at 68 Franklin Rd, at the very least, should be included in the proposed Rural Lifestyle Zone. But as a fully serviced development it could also be rezoned to the General Residential Zone. The statements are applicable to the Bay View urban area and the development site.	The site at 68 Franklin Rd should not be rezoned as the Rural Lifestyle Zone.
Alan Keith Petersen	[List]	281.19	Amend	The introduction statements and provisions are nearly all appropriate for the site at 68 Franklin Rd and the Bay View urban or suburban areas.	The site at 68 Franklin Rd should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone.
Alan Keith Petersen	GRZ - General Residential Zone /Issues /GRZ-I1: Housing supply and diversity	281.20	Amend	The issues are applicable to the Bay View urban area and the development site. The limited future developments will assist in the supply of housing. To meet the HPUDS goals.	The site at 68 Franklin Rd should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone. The Bay View urban residential areas should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone.
Alan Keith Petersen	GRZ - General Residential Zone /Issues /GRZ-I2: Quality living environments	281.21	Amend	The issues are applicable to the development site.	The site at 68 Franklin Rd should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone. The Bay View urban residential areas should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone.
Alan Keith Petersen	GRZ - General Residential Zone /Issues /GRZ-I3: Sustainable design and infrastructure	281.22	Amend	The issues are applicable to the development site.	The site at 68 Franklin Rd should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone. The Bay View urban residential areas should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone.
Alan Keith Petersen	GRZ - General Residential Zone /Issues /GRZ-I4: Non-residential activities	281.23	Amend	The issues are applicable to the Bay View suburban area and the development site.	The site at 68 Franklin Rd should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone. The Bay View urban residential areas should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone.
Alan Keith Petersen	GRZ - General Residential Zone /Objectives /GRZ-O1: Housing supply and diversity	281.24	Amend	All the objectives are applicable to the Bay View suburban area and the development site.	The site at 68 Franklin Rd should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone. The Bay View urban residential areas should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone.

Submitter Name	Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary
Alan Keith Petersen	GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table /General	281.25	Amend	The proposed development at 68 Franklin Road provides for (for the large part) development that complies with the standards in the General Residential Zone. Many of these same standards could be applied to the Bay View urban area. The GRZ is also proposed for the Westshore suburb. This urban environment is very similar to the Bay View urban environment.	The site at 68 Franklin Rd should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone. The Bay View urban residential areas should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone.
Alan Keith Petersen	Planning Maps /General /General	281.26	Amend	Rezone 68 Franklin Road to General Residential Zone. The development (to a large part) applies with the standards of the General Residential Zone, is serviced, and has resource consent.	Rezone 68 Franklin Road to General Residential Zone.
Alan Keith Petersen	Planning Maps /General /General	281.27	Amend	Rezone the urban areas of Bay View that are proposed to be zoned Rural Lifestyle in the PDP and are zoned Rural Settlement Zone in the ODP to General Residential Zone. The residential areas of Bay View are clearly urban in nature and should be zoned in a way that reflects that.	Rezone the urban areas of Bay View that are proposed to be zoned Rural Lifestyle in the PDP and are zoned Rural Settlement Zone in the ODP to General Residential Zone.