

Submitter Name	Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary
Guy Panckhurst	SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Rules Table /SUB-R5: Cross lease title to freehold subdivision	210.1	Amend	Submitter wants to amend SUB-R5. For activity to remain a controlled activity it needs to comply with SUB-S6 to SUB-S18. In the majority of cases the cross leases involve existing buildings with defined restrictive use areas and access arrangements. Many of SUB-S6 to SUB-S18 standards are not relevant to this situation. Many of the matters of control are not relevant to this situation either.	Seeks to amend applicable standards and matters of control to only address issues that need assessing. Seeks to delete the infrastructure requirement that the water supplies need to be completely separate. Reasons are given in detail in the full submission.
Guy Panckhurst	SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table /SUB-S12: Transport, access, and connectivity	210.2	Amend	It is acknowledged that all allotments should have practical vehicle access, but there are sometimes instances when it is not practical to provide a physical access because other works need to occur first, or installing a crossing may result in damage during subsequent building construction activities.	Seeks to acknowledge the situations and allow vehicle crossings to be deferred to the time of Building Consent. Refer to original submission for full reason.
Guy Panckhurst	SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table /SUB-S16: Utility service	210.3	Amend	Considers the wording of SUB-S16 doesn't make it clear if power/gas/telecommunications connections need to be made. Electricity connections should be made available in urban zones, questions why connections are required in rural zones? States this is an added cost that is unjustified and sometimes not required. There are alternatives other than fibre telecommunication cables for urban sites. Fibre network connection should not be a role of the council to dictate.	Seeks to clarify what utility services are required and which are to be physically installed. Seeks to remove the requirement for electricity connections on rural sites at the time of subdivision. Seeks to remove the requirement to provide telecommunications connections at the time of subdivision.
Guy Panckhurst	GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table /GRZ-S4: Other yards	210.4	Amend	Considers that often subdivision proposals involve a new <u>internal</u> boundary along a vehicle access that is less than 1m from an existing building. The applicant is able to provide "self-approval" for the infringement.	Seeks to amend the wording to clarify that the landowner of a site being subdivided can provide consent that the internal yard can be less than 1m. The reasons stated in full detail in the full submission.
Guy Panckhurst	GRZ - General Residential Zone /GRZ - General Residential Zone - Standards Table /GRZ-S10: Windows to the street	210.5	Oppose	Opposes the requirement for 20% street facing glazing in the General Density Residential Zone (GRZ). States that the requirement is in the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) and is more suited for this zone and High Density Residential Zones (HRZ). Glazing control is not appropriate for GRZ, GRZ residents should be able to choose their own glazing.	Seeks to remove GRZ-S10 from plan.
Guy Panckhurst	SUB - Subdivision /Policies /SUB-P9: Integrated provision of infrastructure	210.6	Amend	Considers that electricity should not be required rural sites. Telecommunications should not be required for rural and infill sites. Other options are available for both electricity and telecommunications.	Seeks to remove requirement electricity on rural sites and telecommunications on rural and infill sites.
Guy Panckhurst	TPT - Transport /TPT - Transport - Standards Table /TPT-S1: Car parking	210.7	Amend	Submitter states it is not clear why it is necessary that car parks with more than three spaces are required to be sealed. Low-impact permeable pavement would be preferable from a stormwater perspective. Landscaping strips need to be 2m wide in indigenous plants, but it is not clear why these are preferable, this should not be mandated. a 2m strip is wider than necessary.	Seeks to remove requirement for sealing of 4 or more carparks. Seeks to reduce the planting width to 1m. Seeks to remove restrictions on types of plants.
Guy Panckhurst	SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table /SUB-S1: Minimum allotment sizes - residential	210.8	Amend	It is not clear what "allotment size" means, as it is not defined anywhere. Presumably it means the legal area of the allotment, since there is no mention of net site area.	Seeks to Clarify exactly what is meant by "allotment size".
Guy Panckhurst	Definitions /Definitions /NET SITE AREA	210.9	Amend	It is not clear what is meant by "part of the site used for access". This description is not precise enough for clear interpretation.	Seeks to clearly define "part of the site used for access".
Guy Panckhurst	SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table /SUB-S3: Minimum allotment sizes - rural	210.10	Amend	Considers the allotment size of 5000m2 appropriate but the blanket 1.5ha minimum average is too large. There are many sites that could support an area of less than 1.5ha. development in the hills off the Heretaunga plains should be encouraged. there are areas already zoned as rural lifestyle that could support higher densities. there are already noncomplying applications being approved in this zone.	Seeks to have more investigation as to which areas in the rural residential zones could support higher densities, and re-zone these areas, or allow subdivision as a discretionary or restricted discretionary activity.
Guy Panckhurst	SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table /SUB-S1: Minimum allotment sizes - residential	210.11	Amend	Considers the minimum allotment size of 350m2 under (2) provided no flexibility for two lot infill subdivision when, due to site constraints, either the lot containing the existing dwelling, or the vacant allotment cannot achieve 350m2. This standard could prevent many potential infill subdivisions from occurring. Under 1(b) (ii) there would be an issue under a staged subdivision where some vacant titles are created pending development of dwellings on the next stage. A staged subdivision development would likely not be able to comply with this standard and could compromise funding and cashflow for the next stages. Rather than 1(b)(ii) mandating no vacant allotments, why not ensure that any future building development cannot occur on the vacant allotment unless it is in accordance with the land use consent granted, which could be secured by way of Consent Notice.	Seeks to reduce minimum lot size to 300m2. Seeks to remove the minimum size for allotments containing dwellings. Seeks to allow allotments to be created under under staged subdivision consents. Reasons are stated in detail in the full submission.
Guy Panckhurst	SUB - Subdivision /SUB - Subdivision - Standards Table /SUB-S8: Building platform	210.12	Amend	Considers the standard says there must be a "flood free" building platform, what exactly does this mean? There are many areas in Napier that are potentially susceptible to flooding in certain AEP storms. On new sites the potential flooding hazard is mitigated by setting floor levels that are above the flood level.	Seeks to have the wording of flood free revisited.