Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S3.007	Stephanie Gray	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is an essential part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S3.008	Stephanie Gray	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP.	The reception of daylight and sunlight to each household unit is a critical component of residential amenity that provides warmth and energy efficiency, and is vital for outdoor activities such as gardening and recreation. To ensure shading effects are minimised, and to ensure there is sufficient space around buildings to allow the admission of daylight to the site, this Plan has provided for daylight controls on all side and rear boundaries. The policy also applies to larger non-residential buildings such as schools or halls. The basic premise is that the daylight and sunlight received on a residential site should be no different whether or not the neighbour is residential. This philosophy applies whether the building is on an adjoining site or across a street.	Reject	*Section 6*
S3.009	Stephanie Gray	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words:The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S3.012	Stephanie Gray	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification. Of all places, this is where any medium or high-density zoning should go - people then choose to purchase, rent and live in high-density areas, rather than having it forced upon them where they already live.	Reject	*Section 6*
S3.014	Stephanie Gray	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S3.027	Stephanie Gray	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S3.027.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*

S19.001	Mike Ball	Residential Zones	Oppose	Don't want to see a lot of new houses built, which is entirely satisfactory which renders some existing housing much less liveable than previously because of loss of access to passive solar heating from the sun.	I was broadly in agreement with intensifying residential land use, until I found out more about what is actually proposed. Just as bad is the process for considering this change which appears to be undemocratic. My main concern is with the significant relaxation of the rules around recession angles and particularly the impact this could have on existing residential properties. The proposed new rules may be adequate where a large area is (re)developed and so all the properties are designed with the amount of sun they will receive in mind. I think this is much more difficult when single lots are redeveloped in amongst existing houses. I recognise that not relaxing the recession angles makes it more difficult to build taller houses. In my view this may be a good thing as one of the attractions of Nelson is the relative lack of tall buildings once you leave the CBD.	Reject	*Section 6*

S20.002	Tim Bayley	Residential Zones	Oppose	No development without approval from neighbours [inferred].	Most homes are advertised as being "sunny aspect", "great view", "stunning location"... we bought or we built and we created businesses all within the existing zoning laws that respected everyone's rights to share what Nelson has to offer... And now with the stoke of a pen, Nelson's planners want to take all that away ... and it will be "As of Right" for your neighbours, or the developers they sell to, to do pretty much what they want with no input from you. And for what reason you might well ask? So that some new comers to Nelson can have, just for themselves, what we have been sharing quite happily for the past 150 odd years. Is this how you build a collegial society?... This Plan Change 29 creates an adversarial environment between homeowners and developers and the council. Allowing owners to "as of right" be allowed to make major changes to their property without any consultation or notification of those effected by these changes just creates a very adversarial environment that does not make for good neighbours or neighbourhoods. We all be awaiting the arrival of the demolition crews to start the building of "who knows what" next door to us. Refer to the original submission sections 1, 2 & 3 for more detail.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.002	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	*Section 6*
S20.003	Tim Bayley	Residential Zones	Oppose	In the case of a dispute there should be an independent resource consent panel that hears both side and whose ruling is binding on all parties. This panel should be made up of local architects , planners and locals "of standing"	Refer to reasons in submission point S20.002 and the original submission section 2 for more detail.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.003	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	*Section 6*

S20.004	Tim Bayley	Residential Zones	Oppose	The existing recession planes should remain and "daylight around" should stay as it is in the existing zoning.	There has been a lot of discussion and talk around recession planes in the last 10 weeks and all of it centres around mid-winter sunshine angle of 25.5 degrees in Nelson. The angle was always set at just under this angle, 25 degrees from 2.5 m's high, at your northern boundary so that your northern neighbours could never "build you out" of your share of winter sun. Winter sun is incredibly important in Nelson, for many it is the only form of cost effective heating. The new recession angles are nothing to do with sun they are worked backwards from what will fit for the different zonings and new build heights when these building are placed just 1m from your boundary. So they are of no benefit to you, the existing homeowner, only to the developers who want to intensify the section next to you. The existing recession planes should remain and "daylight around" should stay as it is in the existing zoning as this works well for strange shaped section and section on hills. The new angles all being the same for every boundary does not work for these sites and sections. Refer to the original submission sections 4 for more detail.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.004	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	*Section 6*
S20.005	Tim Bayley	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP.	Refer to reasons in submission point S20.004 and the original submission section 4 for more detail.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS83.005	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	*Section 6*
S20.013	Tim Bayley	Residential Zones	Support in part	Maintain the existing laws for those homeowners that run hosted B&Bs, that allow this to take place for up to 4 guests at a time in your principle place of residence	Refer to reasons in submission point S20.012 and the original submission section 14 for more detail.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
FS83.013	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	*Section 6*

S20.017	Tim Bayley	Residential Zones	Amend	Encourage 2nd dwellings on existing properties, but with the approval of the effected neighbours.	I think Nelsonian's should be encouraging to put small 2nd dwellings on their properties to act as accommodation for extended family or as a rental. There are lots of reasonable priced modular small transportable homes that can be craned into a preprepared foundation in you back or front yard. NCC should pass zoning regulations that make this easy to do and inexpensive but with the approval of the effected neighbours. There should be funds available [from the targeted rates collected from submission points S20.012 and S20.014] to help with the cost of this and for that the rents would be set at affordable or "geared to income amounts". This would help with the shortage of affordable rental accommodation. Refer to the original submission section 18 for more detail.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS83.017	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	*Section 6*
S20.023	Tim Bayley	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain operative residential zone development standards for building height, daylight controls and building setbacks in existing residential areas.	It is quite possible to build within the exist recession planes and setbacks and create more density. There is no reason to go higher that 7.50 m's in height. We built our two story house at just 6.5 m high to the peak and the house is totally adequate and spacious at around 145 m2. We redeveloped our property at Domett St, subdividing off a small back section and building a modest 2 story cottage without going over 6.5m in height and staying well within all the existing daylight angles. We then sold off the front house to two couples who have since added a flat in the lower level, so the density of our original section has quadrupled from 1 couple to 4 couples, and all without impinging on anyone's existing amenities. It can be done. Refer to the original submission sections 5 and 20 for more detail.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS47.001	Wainui Properties Limited		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: All parts. The current operative plan provisions are out of date and will not lead to the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. In particular, the lower density residential zoning is an inefficient outcome. In addition, when considering that the land at 137-155 Nile Street which is located at least one storey below the height of Nile Street, and with the stream to the north and road frontages to the south and east, restricting building height to 2 storey is unnecessary.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS83.023	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	*Section 6*
S24.004	Richard Russell	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Retain the existing sunlight and side yard provisions.	The existing sunlight and sideyard provisions should be retained, but able to be addressed by people affected in the course a transparent hearing and decision making process.	Reject	*Section 6*
S26.003	Eddie Allnutt	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words:The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of privacy as well as encourage residential units to be orientated towards the street or public open space.	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property. We would not like to further lose our privacy and peacefulness either and have more people looking down on us and making noise on our street and nearby streets. We already have enough drunk people causing damage and disruption on narrow Locking Street. A big social housing block in our area isn't going to make things better.	Reject	*Section 6*
S26.005	Eddie Allnutt	Residential Zones	Not Stated	[Make] it easier for a tiny home or a granny flat be added to existing properties.	Intensification is done with blocking people's sun and views. These would be single storey.	Accept	*Section 6*

FS28.122	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Make it easier for a tiny home or granny flat to be added to existing properties. The Tahunanui (flat) and Monaco residential areas are largely outside the PC29 boundaries and comprise either standard residential or low-density zoning. A tiny home or granny flat comprises a residential unit and would provide for residential intensification if allowed as a permitted activity on existing properties with an existing residential unit. There are a number of areas that are not appropriate for further residential intensification in particular those areas subject to the Nelson Airport Overlays.	Reject	*Section 6*
S26.013	Eddie Allnutt	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS5.005	Warwick Rogers		Support	Accept	Plan 29 is a total mess of an idea that tramples on the rights of thousands of hard working rate payers and will negatively the well being of thousands.	Reject	*Section 6*

S26.016	Eddie Allnutt	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S26.018	Eddie Allnutt	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning. We consider that if this zoning is confirmed it would enable a large development capacity as of right. Therefore any applications for departures from this to enable even more intensive development should be notified to neighbours.	Reject	*Section 6*
S26.027	Eddie Allnutt	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S26.031.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S26.041	Eddie Allnutt	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S26.013.	Accept	*Section 6*

S27.001	Yvette Byrd	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Do not] allow 3 and 6 story buildings in established residential areas. [Consider] alternatives [including]: Single/Double story infill, Higher buildings in the CBD and Higher buildings in future subdivisions, so tenants and owners are aware of the environment they will be living in.	The need for housing can be achieved without taking away the rights of existing residents. Without forcing people to live under either the reality or the threat of being loomed over by a multi-storey building. When I bought my house I looked long and hard to find a house with privacy and sun. It feels like an abuse of power to threaten to take that away without my consent. I have family members who have benefited directly from social housing in Nelson. The house they were placed in had sun and privacy. It was truely a lifesaver. I am pro housing, I am pro social housing. One or two story, controlled, well designed infill makes a lot of sense. Thoughtfully designed higher structures in the CBD or in areas where sun angles and privacy allows, makes a lot of sense. Even 6 story structures in new subdivisions where tenants and owners are aware of the environment they will be living in, makes sense. Putting a large proportion of our population under permanent threat of being overshadowed and having their privacy taken away is an abuse of power. Personally it feels like a spectre hanging over me and is already causing anxiety and lost sleep. I'm sure it doesn't compare to housing insecurity or homelessness but I'm not saying I don't want homes for all. Am I. Leaving the future of much of our city in the hands of profit driven developers is madness. What could possibly go wrong?	Reject	*Section 6*
S33.001	Katherine Sandston	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Oppose the Plan Change to allow 6 storey buildings within the residential area opposite 26 Bronte Street.	The proposed building heights detract from the charm of this part of the city and are close to the new Richmond Heritage Precinct. There is also a school close by - Nelson Girls College. Allowing such buildings only increases more activity within this part of the city. There is already a lack of car parking in this area.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S36.004	Sarah-Jane Weir	Residential Zones	Oppose	Reduce the maximum building height to 8m, with anything higher being non-complying and subject to resource consent processes	Refer to reasons in submission point S36.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS70.005	Michael and Sita Monaghan		Support	Accept	Submission supported in full.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS78.442	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission I support are: various. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences; amenity and value in the CBD and residential areas will be lost if it goes ahead.	Reject	*Section 6*
S36.015	Sarah-Jane Weir	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Give consideration to] well thought out lower-rise town houses, small apartment blocks, granny flats and partitioned properties.	There is the opportunity for our city to have more people living enjoyably close to it, in well thought out lower-rise town houses, small apartment blocks, granny flats and partitioned properties. In the FDS 2022, intensification was preferred through alternative typologies such as portioning, tiny homes and good examples of medium density including town houses. Council should hold true to those community values when thinking about its urban planning.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
FS40.007	Belinda Reburn		Support	Accept	The S36 submission asserts that one of the things that is valuable about our whole city is how the sky scape is reflected in the nature of it's green city fringes. The valuing of this connection with our city fringes is resonated in my original submission. Protection of the views and connections we have with the surrounding Grampians, Centre of New Zealand, Brook Valley area and the Dun Mountain is what sets our smart little city apart and is of paramount importance to Nelson.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

FS38.001	Small Time Developments		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support are: [Give consideration to] well thought out lower-rise town houses, small apartment blocks, granny flats and partitioned properties. Agree with the intention of PC29 to encourage intensification through infill development but acknowledge that there are many opportunities for less intrusive development to achieve this, such as low-rise townhouses, granny flats and partitioned properties.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
FS70.015	Michael and Sita Monaghan		Support	Accept	Submission supported in full.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS78.453	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission I support are: various. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences; amenity and value in the CBD and residential areas will be lost if it goes ahead.	Accept in part	*Section 9 - Overview and Strategic S42A Report*
S42.008	Mary Bronsteter	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S42.009	Mary Bronsteter	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S42.008.	Accept	*Section 6*

S42.010	Mary Bronsteter	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S42.013	Mary Bronsteter	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S42.015	Mary Bronsteter	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S42.028	Mary Bronsteter	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S42.028.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S43.001	Linda Hooper-Smith	Residential Zones	Oppose	Change the plan to allow low impact intensification, ie. One additional property on an existing section, and to be subject to resource consent and daylight angles being observed.	Councils plan to address the housing shortage must not be at the expense of the health and wellbeing of existing home owners and occupants. Removing a home owners/occupants access to daylight, will have an enormous impact on their health and wellbeing and this will have negative impacts on the community as a whole.	Reject	*Section 6*
S52.002	Gloria Lines	Residential Zones	Oppose	Keep the high rises where they already are.	High rise cheek by jowl apartments is a proven recipe for poor mental and physical health resulting neighbour to neighbour conflict... Sunlight would be severely compromised, resulting in increased health problems for residents and a corresponding toll on our nation's health resources... [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S52.011	Gloria Lines	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: • Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. • Reduced level of physical well being • Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. • Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. • Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. • Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. • Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. • Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S52.012	Gloria Lines	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S52.011.	Reject	*Section 6*
S52.013	Gloria Lines	Residential Zones	Oppose	following bold and bracketedwords: The building Act controls windows in walls ofbuildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure thatresidential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonabledegree of privacy as well as encourage residential units to be	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S52.016	Gloria Lines	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S52.018	Gloria Lines	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*

S52.031	Gloria Lines	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S52.030.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S53.001	Barbara-Jean Edwards	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure Resource Consent is required for any new development or building.	Neighbourhood residents must be allowed to have input before any resource consent is approved.	Reject	*Section 6*
S53.005	Barbara-Jean Edwards	Residential Zones	Oppose	Allow more lower-density housing areas defined by the typical housing in that area, with particular respect to number of storeys allowed on new builds.	The areas Council have mapped for the different housing densities do not correspond to the types of residential houses in each neighbourhood, and will potentially destroy that community feel.	Reject	*Section 6*
S54.005	Pauline Warne	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Request] the rear side yards setback of not less than 1.5 metres.	1 The creation of a High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), that has a maximum height greater than 12 metres as it is not mandated under NPS-UD 2020. 2 the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is a critical component of residential amenity in a city as it provides warmth & energy efficiency. 3 The omission of any requirement to provide new carparks in any new development. 4 The sewerage infrastucture in Nile St,already floods in times of heavy rain, before the introduction of significant increase in residences.	Reject	*Section 6*
S57.001	Nigel Whinney	Mapping	Oppose in part	Exclude areas close to reserves or adjacent to parks or rivers from Plan Change 29.	1. Areas next to rivers are liable to flooding as evidenced by last year's catastrophe. 2. There should not be tall buildings built on land that is subject to earthquakes or fault lines. 3. Tall buildings near areas of recreation or natural beauty should not be permitted. 4. Property owners near proposed developments should be allowed to voice their opinions. 5. Tall buildings cut out light and warmth from adjacent properties. This is a breach of human rights. 6. The right to privacy is severely eroded by overlooking tall buildings. 7. There are plenty of other areas near the CBD that are more suitable for development that riverside ones. 8. The values of affected properties will be eroded and rates will rise, probably exponentially, thus forcing those on pensions out of their homes.	Reject	*Section 6*

S59.001	Colin Bell	Residential Zones	Amend	[Reduce] the maximum number of storeys in the high density zone from 6 to 4.	The proposed plan goes too far, too fast. It would be prudent to allow a maximum of 4 storeys initially - and review the overall impact in 5 years. Impact on social wellbeing, infrastructure issues etc should inform future changes. Also, in five years we'll be better informed as to the rate and timescale of extra sea level rise arising from the collaspe of the Western Antarctic ice shelf. It may be economically unwise to develop the CBD as proposed. Ref: The Guardian 23/10/23 https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2023/oct/23/rapid-ice-melt-in-west-antarctica-now-inevitable-research-shows.	Reject	*Section 6*
S60.016	Dan McGuire	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS20.16	Tim Bayley		Support	Accept	It is critical that existing Homeowners retain the right to their existing daylight and sunshine .... that they built their houses to comply with existing standards that work for everyone to share passive sun and be able to install solar heating...	Reject	*Section 6*

S60.017	Dan McGuire	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NPMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S60.016.	Reject	*Section 6*
S60.018	Dan McGuire	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of privacy as well as encourage residential units to be	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S60.021	Dan McGuire	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S60.023	Dan McGuire	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S60.036	Dan McGuire	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S60.035.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S60.039	Dan McGuire	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S60.040	Dan McGuire	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S60.041	Dan McGuire	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S62.008	Beverly Sellers	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words:The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*

S62.019	Beverly Sellers	Residential Zones	Not Stated	[Propose] a Whakatu Nelson Urban Design Guide should be created with community and design industry input into the design process for	Not stated.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S62.021	Beverly Sellers	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S62.009.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S62.022	Beverly Sellers	Residential Zones	Not Stated	[Request] rear and side yard setback of not less than 1.5 metres.	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S63.001	Vivian Sellers	Residential Zones	Amend	[Request] rear and side yard setback of not less than 1.5 metres.	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S63.011	Vivian Sellers	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S63.012	Vivian Sellers	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words:The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S63.014	Vivian Sellers	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*

S63.016	Vivian Sellers	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S63.028	Vivian Sellers	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NPMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S63.011.	Accept	*Section 6*
S63.034	Vivian Sellers	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S63.022.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S66.002	Thomas Trainer	Residential Zones	Oppose	Leave the plan as it is.	I believe that allowing two story buildings in a residential area should be rigorously tested to make sure neighbours are not adversely affected full stop. Don't have a problem with multiple buildings but not towering over the neighbours.	Accept	*Section 6*
S69.001	Phillip Robson	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Amend the rules so that sites within the FDS area shown as N104] cannot build more than 3 storeys, unless it affects no dwellings behind.	We live at 53 Fifeshire Cresent. The map shows that housing could be 4 to 6 storeys in front of us. If such building did not alter our view of the harbour , then that's fine, but it looks as if it will reduces our view. We bought in this location with the view, and I cannot support high rise apartments blocking our view. That is not fair to change the zoning and have a significant devaluation of our property. The plan is not easy to read, and submitting is also technically difficult. I oppose any height on the area shown as N104 (which I can't find details of) that's affects any view of the harbour from our property. I want the area N 104 to state it cannot build more than 3 storeys, unless it affects no dwellings behind.	Accept	*Section 6*

S71.001	Julie Gibbs	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain existing zoning] for residential areas in Atawhai Dodson Valley.	We bought our house, primarily because of the views we have. Proceeding with this plan could mean we would lose those views and devalue our property. It could also mean we would lose access to the same amount of sun we have. I would prefer to see new land developed with purpose-built 'villages' that don't impact current property holders and people are buying those properties knowing that is what they get ie some of the Bishopdale land being developed or further out in Atawhai/Wakapuaka/Hira areas.	Reject	*Section 6*
S73.002	Sally Gepp	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Maintain existing zoning (or applyzoning with same effect) for the areacomprising Tasman Street, Alton Street,Erin Street and Brookside (betweenCollingwood Street and	On the basis of the special character and heritage values of this area.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS65.032	Heritage Nelson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission we support is: Maintain existing zoning (or apply zoning with same effect) for the area comprising Tasman Street, Alton Street, Erin Street and Brookside (between Collingwood Street and Cleveland Terrace). Reasons include (please also refer to our original submission #831 as in many cases multiple reasons have been noted): PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new study on effects of proposals on heritage and character of City is required. The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice. It has been undertaken by one person rather than a multidisciplinary team.	Reject	*Section 6*

S75.008	Eliot Sinclair and Partners Ltd	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Delete rules REr.18L and REr.17L.	The outlook rules assume there is space in a development that can create an unbroken view over the outdoor living court from a dwelling's living area and bedrooms. In addition, the outdoor living court's minimum dimensions and the setbacks to the boundary do not facilitate the outlook space required and complicates what is meant to be an enabling plan change for increasing dwellings. This rule will be difficult to comply with in existing residential zones for infill type developments.	Reject	*Section 6*
S75.009	Eliot Sinclair and Partners Ltd	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Amend rule REr.17C.1 to increase building coverage to 50%.	The standard site coverage is 40% for Residential Zones, while the proposal is to retain the site coverage of 40% for the General Residential zone, allowing the potential for three dwellings. The site coverage remaining the same does not encourage residential development on existing sites. The proposed plan change has assumed that Nelson developers and landowners will want the same provisions that are required for Tier 1 Councils and that the increase of density needs to go upwards. Nelson is historically a low-rise city with natural landscape constraints and small areas to develop in. The cost to go upwards is more expensive than infill development and natural progression of density of Nelson is for more infill development opportunities. A 40% site coverage will be difficult to comply with for infill development and we have suggested a change to the site coverage that matches the Medium Residential Zone of 50%..	Reject	*Section 6*

S77.008	Tracy Manning	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. Blocking the sun and solar not working, constant shade on properties and ground is not supporting an environmental progression of reducing our carbon footprint.	Reject	Section 6
S77.009	Tracy Manning	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. Blocking the sun and solar not working, constant shade on properties and ground is not supporting an environmental progression of reducing our carbon footprint.	Reject	Section 6
S77.010	Tracy Manning	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. Blocking the sun and solar not working, constant shade on properties and ground is not supporting an environmental progression of reducing our carbon footprint.	Reject	Section 6
S78.003	Jaimie Barber	Residential Zones	Support in part	Increase site coverage.	Site coverage should be increased to provide better utilisation of land. We wouldn't need so much parking space if we had better public transport.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S82.019	Annette (Nettie) Barrow	Residential Zones	Not Stated	All residential housing zones, including green-field developments, could accommodate a range of building typographies, including stand-alone, townhouses and terraced housing. Two stories would be the permitted height, but in all areas, with UDA assessment, considering appropriate location, existing buildings or landscape features, landforms, and amenity values, consideration of multi-story developments could be considered.	I recommend the excellent publication, ArchitectureNow's feature on Design critical to NZ housing intensification. (first posted 1st July 2022) NZ architect Rob Guild comments 'NZ severely lacks design governance. The national Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD), provides some positive steps in promoting higher density around town centres.... However, it fails to focus on design quality of future developments and the level of amenity human beings need in higher density settings.' The article provides excellent examples of intensification developments.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
FS83.301	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Submitter raises many issues that need to be addressed. A very good submission and I agree with all points.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
FS83.303	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Submitter raises many issues that need to be addressed. A very good submission and I agree with all points.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S82.023	Annette (Nettie) Barrow	Residential Zones	Not Stated	Residential developments for older citizens have demonstrated the potential for innovation of our housing typographies and ownership structures of our living environment, but what is need is the promotion of a more private/communal ownership model rather than	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.305	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Submitter raises many issues that need to be addressed. A very good submission and I agree with all points.	Reject	*Section 6*
S83.003	Rob Greenaway	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Amend the residential zone rules so that] permitted development envelopes in the Residential zones are maintained to allow, for example, two-story terrace housing by retaining REr.17J.1, but making the proposed additional permitted height allowances (specifically REr.18J.1, REr.19J.1) discretionary.	The proposed status for many new activities in the proposed Residential zones is largely either permitted or restricted discretionary. Considering the scale of change proposed by PC29 in this zone - and the lack of comprehensive planning - most, if not all of the proposed restricted discretionary activities should be discretionary to allow more community dialogue about the specific effects of a proposed development. [Refer to the original Submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

FS39.006	Richard Harden and Rachel Reese		Support	Accept	This submission point correctly identifies the ad hoc and adverse effects that PC29 is enabling. A failure by NCC to engage with its communities and to undertake spacial and neighbourhood planning prior to initiating the plan change compromises good urban development outcomes, including increasing housing supply.	Reject	*Section 6*
S83.004	Rob Greenaway	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Amend the rules so that] relevant restricted discretionary rule provisions in the General Residential Zone become discretionary, specifically, for example, REr.17B.3, REr.17J.3, REr.17K.3 and REr.17L.3. and If the Medium and High Density Residential Zones are retained, the proposed permitted and restricted discretionary rules REr.18J.1, REr.18B.3,	Most, if not all of the proposed restricted discretionary activities should be discretionary to allow more community dialogue about the specific effects of a proposed development. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS39.007	Richard Harden and Rachel Reese		Support	Accept	This submission point correctly identifies the ad hoc and adverse effects that PC29 is enabling.	Reject	*Section 6*
S83.006	Rob Greenaway	Residential Zones	Amend	Add more robust neighbourhood and spatial planning requirements in the Urban Design chapter of the NRMP and tidy references to the NCC Urban Design Protocol Action Plan and NCC Urban Design Action Plan (DO13A.1.1.vi, DO13A.3.2.v). These may need to be removed	This is essential if the proposed additional permitted height allowances in REr.18J.1 and REr.19J.1 remain permitted or restricted discretionary. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S83.007	Rob Greenaway	Residential Zones	Amend	Review and tidy changes and retained components of the Urban Design chapter generally. For example, DO13A.6.1.viii has a proposed change to refer to 'use' of an Urban Design Panel, rather than to 'create' one. DO13A.3.3.ii retains "Create and implement an Urban Design Panel ...."	Retained method DO13A.1.1.vi refers to "Implementation of actions in the Nelson City Council Urban Design Action Plan". Retained method DO13A.3.2.v states "Implement actions in the NCC Urban Design Protocol Action Plan". The latter was prepared in 2008 and is well out of date, far-predating the 2019 and 2022 FDS reports. NCC has confirmed for me that DO13A.1.1.vi refers to the 2008 NCC Urban Design Protocol Action Plan and not some more recent document.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS39.009	Richard Harden and Rachel Reese		Support	Accept	Nelson City Council is out of date with current and best practice and PC29 can not reply on externally referenced/supporting documents in the plan provisions.	Reject	*Section 6*

S86.001	Hazel Thelin	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S87.002	Jane Horder	Residential Zones	Support	Ensure that there is a process to allow for more discretion and assessment of new buildings.	More discretion and assessment will lead to better design, visual quality, privacy and outlook when new buildings are proposed.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S87.003	Jane Horder	Residential Zones	Support	[Provide] some daylight protection for existing buildings.	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S88.002	Jacquetta Bell	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Retain the existing regulation on daylight.	Refer to reasons in submission point S88.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S88.003	Jacquetta Bell	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Retain the consent process and consultation with neighbours, at least in a modified form.	Refer to reasons in submission point S88.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S88.004	Jacquetta Bell	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Implement guidelines for apartment blocks that foster community and provide amenities such as play areas, community gardens, shared spaces and facilities	Refer to reasons in submission point S88.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S90.005	Andrew & Margreet Petheram	Residential Zones	Support in part	[Amend the rules to enable] three houses on one section but a maximum of two stories.	Support three houses on one section but a maximum of two stories.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS5.028	Warwick Rogers		Support in part	Accept in part	2 story maximum is perfect # houses to a section needs to be looked at very carefully though, many areas will support that.	Reject	*Section 6*
S91.005	Caroline Astridge	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Do not allow substantial developments which could have massive impacts on the neighbours and environs to proceed [without resource consent].	I am terribly concerned by the "no resource consent" approach of this proposal in view of the size and nature of what is proposed to be allowed.	Reject	*Section 6*
S91.006	Caroline Astridge	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Consider as an alternative allowing easier subdivisions for such as granny flats.	The current regulations are overly onerous and prevent people from providing housing. For example, the need to fireproof walls if the dwellings are attached. Is this really necessary if there are multiple and good means of egress from the building? The removal of other red tape could open up the market to locals providing extra housing - surely this is a better alternative to destroying our town with uncontrolled and very large developments?	Accept	*Section 6*
S92.005	Paul Nicholson	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Require developers who seek to increase the number of units in a project beyond the base requirements of the Plan, to notify neighbours of their intent; provide a process for objections and review when an expansion of the number	It is only fair to a neighbourhood to give property owners the right to know what changes are proposed in a project after resource consent has been given.	Reject	*Section 6*

S92.013	Paul Nicholson	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Amend the Plan to recognise the rights of existing property owners in terms of access to sunlight and to preserve the character of our city.	Existing residents have invested, both financially and emotionally, in our city. Those investments need to be protected.	Reject	*Section 6*
S102.002	Zoe Teece	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Oppose] the sunlight rules changing and the ability to build housing right Infront of our property.	We have 4 square meters of glass, that's it! only 4! and we won't be able to enjoy this area with our dog or children when that time comes due to insane rule change. We get home after hours of working each day and have a few hours each afternoon where we can enjoy the sunlight, get out washing done, and connect as couple on our back doorstep. All of this is going to be taken away with darkness and cold. Our house would receive no sunlight in the hours we are home, and we cannot afford to run heaters, the dryer for our clothing, nor do I have the time to clean mold out of our house every day because of this. You won't be decreasing the rate for people with no sunlight, so this is going to cost us huge living cost which in return means we have to work more and spend less time together as a family.	Reject	*Section 6*
S107.002	Natalie Cozens	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the intensification of residental zones.	The loss of sunlight, privacy and daylight will impact greatly on peoples wellbeing both physically and mentally.	Reject	*Section 6*

S109.004	Joyanne Stevens	Residential Zones	Oppose	Reduce the maximum building height as it relates to high density residential development [inferred].	Objective RE2 outlines the essential components of a principally residential environment including access to an adequate amount of daylight, minimal disturbance from nuisances, and a reasonable degree of privacy. The proposed high density residential zone will inevitably remove these essential components from existing residential dwellings in the area. Lack of consideration of the established rights and expectations of current resident. Policy RE2.3 provides that "buildings and structures should be designed and sited so that adjoining sites are not unduly shaded, and there is reasonable access to daylight". The ability for six storey buildings to be erected as of right will inevitably mean that existing adjoining sites will be severely shaded and access to daylight severely compromised. Policy RE2.4 provides that "the location and design of buildings should not unduly compromise outlook and privacy of adjoining development", but then immediately gives developers an out by the addition of the words "having regard to the planned built character of the area and the reasonable expectations for development". So this allows large inappropriate developments to be constructed in existing residential areas with no regard at all for the existing amenity values of those areas. Policy RE2.5 provides that "the size and scale of buildings, structures, and activities should be compatible with the planned built character and amenity of the residential areas". Again this allows large scale inappropriate development in existing residential areas as of right. Policy RE2.9 enables "development of existing or new sites to create a high standard of amenity for residents within and adjoining a development". The construction of buildings up to six storeys in height will adversely affect existing residential housing adjoining any new developments. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S109.006	Joyanne Stevens	Residential Zones	Oppose	Reestablish the resource consent requirement for multi-storey developments as currently provided for [in the operative residential zone, inferred]	Refer to the reasons in submission point S109.005.	Reject	*Section 6*

S109.008	Joyanne Stevens	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S113.013	Barbara Greene	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Commit to the principle of] social equity, which recognises that: Lower income neighbourhoods are often viewed as less deserving than higher income neighbourhoods. Intensification in lower income areas must be done with as much sensitivity, care and expense as in high income areas. Intensification should help eliminate	Refer to reasons in submission points S113.004 and S113.005.	Reject	*Section 6*
S113.020	Barbara Greene	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Do not] try to retrofit high density / multi-storey buildings into existing suburbs / neighbourhoods.	Higher density living needs to be planned for to include integrated green spaces, adequate sunlight, access to services, traffic flow, pedestrian safety and community gathering spaces. The inevitable need for increased policing cannot be ignored either. Retrofitting into existing suburban communities simply does not achieve this as well as purpose designed subdivision.	Reject	*Section 6*
S114.001	Matt Ellery	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] rear and side yard setbacks and recession planes in the NRMP: - setbacks to remain at 1.50m minimum. - recession planes to remain at 2.5m + angle dependenton site orientation and boundary.	Protection of existing sunlight because it's a critical component of residential living as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. Loss of sunlight may result in one's ability to grow their own fruit and vegetables; loss of ability to generate solar energy in lieu of purchasing through the national grid.	Reject	*Section 6*

S114.002	Matt Ellery	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Oppose] the increase in maximum height of buildings to heights above the existing limit of 7.50m.	Raising this height limit sets the scene for even higher buildings being permissable via Resource Consent application. To now have the rules changed and the possibility of a 6 storey building built directly in front (or to the rear and side of us) will drastically affect the enjoyment we get from our current property. We are a lovely neighbourhood and have a friendly relationship with all our neighbours as we all respect each others enjoyment of their properties. A large 6 story building will affect our views (a large reason for living where I do), reduce the "neighbourhood" feel that already exists and which we all add value to.	Reject	*Section 6*
S116.002	Jill Ford	Residential Zones	Support in part	[Amend] so there is no restriction on 'footprint' [building coverage], unless it is due to eg, slip zones, inadequate infrastructure, - waste water, etc.	The big issue is the 'footprint' a maximum of 40% is ridiculously low and need to be much bigger. In fact all that is needed is distance away from neighbouring properties and sunlight. Council shouldn't be basically insisting that residents have big gardens or massive driveways. This would enable more dense housing of less height.	Reject	*Section 6*
S116.003	Jill Ford	Residential Zones	Support in part	Allow three storeys without additional building consent.	Many of the older houses (we live on cnr of Collingwood and Brougham) are already effectively 3 stories, i.e over 8m high.	Reject	*Section 6*
S116.005	Jill Ford	Residential Zones	Support in part	Greater requirement for disability access in all multiunit developments.	Given the growing older population and that Nelson already has a higher % of over 65yr.	Accept	*Section 6*
S117.001	James Saunders	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend REr.18M and 17M so that an alteration to an existing house does not have to go through an assessment and possibly a resource consent due to the 20% glazing to the street rule.	The rule and the govt. directive applies to new development of multi unit house not existing housing and was not intended to impose a new rule on existing housing stock seeking to do alterations to improve their houses.	Reject	*Section 6*
S118.002	Maurice Ormsby	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S118.006	Maurice Ormsby	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S118.007	Maurice Ormsby	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S119.002	Mary Ormsby	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres. Build high rise over carparks - parking can be on lower levels as e.g. in Auckland and Wellington. Much of central Nelson commercial and retail area is highly unattractive - build high rise there with retail and commercial on lower levels.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is a critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. I am concerned about the affects on the health of residents if high and densely built blocks block sunlight and prevent air circulation. It seems absurd that we have at least 3 large car parking squares where motor vehicles bask in sunlight all day while we are contemplating plunging human residents into daylong shadow. The visual effects of heritage buildings overshadowed by multi-storey buildings. We have some unique heritage areas - these are of benefit not just to those who live in them but to those who see them i.e. visitors and tourists.	Reject	Section 6
S119.003	Mary Ormsby	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. I am concerned about the affects on the health of residents if high and densely built blocks block sunlight and prevent air circulation.	Reject	Section 6

S119.004	Mary Ormsby	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. I am concerned about the affects on the health of residents if high and densely built blocks block sunlight and prevent air circulation.	Reject	Section 6
S120.001	Marion Van Dijk	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. NN prides itself on sunshine hours - I would be sadly impacted if such a building was north of me - I would lose sun significantly and of course heating and wellbeing (like many others).	Reject	Section 6
S120.002	Marion Van Dijk	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. NN prides itself on sunshine hours - I would be sadly impacted if such a building was north of me - I would lose sun significantly and of course heating and wellbeing (like many others).	Reject	Section 6
S120.003	Marion Van Dijk	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. NN prides itself on sunshine hours - I would be sadly impacted if such a building was north of me - I would lose sun significantly and of course heating and wellbeing (like many others).	Reject	Section 6
S121.001	Catherine Beattie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S121.002	Catherine Beattie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S121.003	Catherine Beattie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S121.009	Catherine Beattie	Residential Zones	Not Stated	[Enable] kitset housing with small yards for quality.	Not stated.	Accept	*Section 6*
S122.001	Linda Holloway	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S122.002	Linda Holloway	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S122.003	Linda Holloway	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S123.001	Anne Kolless	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S123.002	Anne Kolless	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S123.003	Anne Kolless	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S124.001	Brian Strong	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. I reject the loss of daylight and sunlight angles as indicated in the proposal. I reject the loss of the views that would be a result of the proposal. I reject the loss of privacy that would occur as a result of the height of any new building on the boundary as proposed in the new plan. The loss of sunlight would affect any advantage for alternative solar panel heating.	Reject	Section 6
S124.002	Brian Strong	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. I reject the loss of daylight and sunlight angles as indicated in the proposal. I reject the loss of the views that would be a result of the proposal. I reject the loss of privacy that would occur as a result of the height of any new building on the boundary as proposed in the new plan. The loss of sunlight would affect any advantage for alternative solar panel heating.	Reject	Section 6
S124.003	Brian Strong	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S124.016	Brian Strong	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S124.017	Brian Strong	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S124.016.	Reject	*Section 6*
S124.018	Brian Strong	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S124.021	Brian Strong	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S124.023	Brian Strong	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S124.037	Brian Strong	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S124.36.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*

S128.001	Avril Peterson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S128.002	Avril Peterson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S128.003	Avril Peterson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S131.001	Diane Chandler	Mapping	Oppose	Oppose the change of the zoning in the area [724 - 792 Main Road Stoke, including Lucy Murcott Place, Sequoia and Sterling Way] from low density to general density.	I oppose the change of the zoning in our area from low density to general density. This doesnt appropriately recognise the character and amentity of our existing residential area and would have a more than minor effect on the overall amenity of the local environment as enjoyed by existing residents. It doesnt suit the area with the large old homestead (built 1914) and gardens. When our subdivision was built it was deemed a low density housing area. this was to preserve the environmental factors of the area, the heritage trees and the heritage property. We, and our neighbours, built knowing this was a low density area. We wish for low density zoning to remain for our property. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S131.002	Diane Chandler	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the removal of any current daylight angles that affect any residential home and these should not be changed or removed for any building in a residential area, or any building that will affect an existing residential home.	Existing neighbouring properties will lose aesthetics, daylight and sunlight... Solar panels will be less effective. People will not be able to enjoy the outdoor areas... loss of enjoyment and privacy of your own home...by blocking light and sun it affects moods and mental health. A number of commissioners reports from the environment court regarding multi storey intensive buildings in a residential area. All of these reports supported the existing residents and considered shading effects as relevant to the amenity of the area and the qualities and characteristics of the area that contribute to people's appreciation and its pleasantness. they advise that shading has an adverse effect on the enjoyment and appreciation of the pleasantness of the area and amenity values. They also mention existing residents right to privacy and quiet enjoyment of their homes. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 6
S131.003	Diane Chandler	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose any buildings over two storeys in residential areas which will affect existing residential homes.	The plan would change the suburban character in a way that could set a precedent. The planned character of the single house zone in Nelson is one of predominantly one or two-storey buildings 'within a generally spacious setting'. If the subject site is developed as allowed that area of single house zone cannot realistically be said to be predominantly in accordance with the character. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S131.004	Diane Chandler	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless all affected neighbours give written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S135.004	Matthew Schep	Residential Zones	Not Stated	Require new builds to be fully accessible to disabled people, older people, and children, if this is not already codified elsewhere.	Equitable access to housing is a human right for everyone, no matter their mobility capability.	Reject	Section 6
S135.005	Matthew Schep	Residential Zones	Support	Support the right for neighbours of future build sites to be consulted with adequately by developers prior to and during development.	History shows us that private companies too often run roughshod over the needs of communities in pursuit of profit. People should come before profit in all instances in a fair society that cares for its members.	Reject	Section 6
S137.001	Sherrilyn Spilman	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Restrict] buildings of only two storeys to be allowed as of right in all residential areas.	I totally oppose the proposal to allow buildings as high as six storeys as of right in residential areas. What must be considered is the affect on neighbours and neighbourhoods including loss of outlook, loss of privacy and loss of solar access, deprivation of which has a negative impact on mental and physical wellbeing including on the warmth of homes. People want to come to Nelson and stay here because of its attractive character, sunshine and views, all of which will be detrimentally affected if this plan change is allowed.	Reject	Section 6

S137.002	Sherrilyn Spilman	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Look at measures that facilitate mews and townhouse developments in the residential zones, instead of these permissive height	Refer to the reasons in submission point S137.001.	Reject	Section 6
S139.001	Ben Gardner-Thorne	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Reject] the councils plans to change the daylight rules.	I 100% disagree with the councils plans to change our daylight rules. With this change we could see areas around us building 6 story buildings giving us no sunlight in the hours we are home after long days at work to pay our mortgage.	Reject	*Section 6*
S140.002	Jon Wahlberg	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Allow only one dwelling adjacent to the Rural Zone, including Rural - Lower Density Small Holdings Area [RE.r17.B, Rule RE.r18.B and RE.r23.1.	Object to 3 dwellings on sections adjacent to the Rural Zone, including Rural - Lower Density Small Holdings Area. Refer to reasons in submission point S140.001.	Reject	Section 6
S140.003	Jon Wahlberg	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Provide a setback of 25m for dwellings from the Rural Zone [in relation to Rule REr.17.E and Rule REr.18.E].	This is consistent with the TRMP which recognises the importance of increased separation to support rural activities. [Refer to the reasons in S140.001].	Reject	Section 6
S140.008	Jon Wahlberg	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Seek that allotments that adjoins any Rural zone have a width of at least 34.5 metres between the zone boundary and the farthest boundary of the allotment. (This being a 25m rural boundary offset, 8m shape factor and	[Refer to reasons in submission point S140.001].	Reject	Section 6
S145.002	Genevieve Gilchrist	Residential Zones	Oppose	Retain the daylight (I.e. sunlight) angles we have under the current plan.	Refer to reasons in submission point S145.001. Also the thought of going through winter without sunshine, in a cold and damp house and extra heating expenses is also very stressful.	Reject	*Section 6*
S146.001	Murray Dench	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S146.002	Murray Dench	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S146.003	Murray Dench	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S147.001	Rosemary Weir	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S147.002	Rosemary Weir	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S147.003	Rosemary Weir	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S148.001	Natalya Dempsey	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S148.002	Natalya Dempsey	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S148.003	Natalya Dempsey	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S149.001	Cheryl Walls	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S149.002	Cheryl Walls	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S149.003	Cheryl Walls	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S150.001	Keryn McKay	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S150.002	Keryn McKay	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S150.003	Keryn McKay	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S151.001	Janice Michel	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S151.002	Janice Michel	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S151.003	Janice Michel	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S152.001	Christine Parai	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S152.002	Christine Parai	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S152.003	Christine Parai	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S153.001	John Cunningham	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S153.002	John Cunningham	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S153.003	John Cunningham	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S154.001	Sharon Thomas	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S154.002	Sharon Thomas	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S154.003	Sharon Thomas	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S155.001	Giulia Rogers	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S155.002	Giulia Rogers	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S155.003	Giulia Rogers	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S156.001	Sylvia Meredyth	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S156.002	Sylvia Meredyth	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S156.003	Sylvia Meredyth	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S157.001	Belinda-Jane Hart	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S157.002	Belinda-Jane Hart	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S157.003	Belinda-Jane Hart	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S161.001	Chris and Sandra Sutcliffe	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S161.002	Chris and Sandra Sutcliffe	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S161.003	Chris and Sandra Sutcliffe	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S162.001	Mark Gabites	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S162.002	Mark Gabites	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S162.003	Mark Gabites	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S163.001	Pauline Rodgers	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S163.002	Pauline Rodgers	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S163.003	Pauline Rodgers	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S163.013	Pauline Rodgers	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Give consideration to regulations and design standards to craft purposeful and well-designed living spaces].	Of particular concern is the possible breakdown of regulations, potentially leading to subpar design standards that merely prioritize providing shelter, rather than crafting purposeful and well-designed living spaces.	Accept	*Section 6*
S164.001	Leigh Thompson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S164.002	Leigh Thompson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S164.003	Leigh Thompson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S165.001	Adele Yank	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S165.002	Adele Yank	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S165.003	Adele Yank	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S166.001	Garth Crosbie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S166.002	Garth Crosbie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S166.003	Garth Crosbie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S167.001	Petra Dunlop	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S167.002	Petra Dunlop	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S167.003	Petra Dunlop	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S167.009	Petra Dunlop	Residential Zones	Oppose	Seek that [the daylight angles in plan change 29] be removed and replaced with existing daylight angles under current [Nelson Resource Management Plan]	I oppose the daylight angles in plan change 29.	Reject	Section 6
S167.011	Petra Dunlop	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Add] rules that ensure complexes are managed in a way that adds value and enhances the surrounding areas	Not stated.	Accept	Section 6

S167.012	Petra Dunlop	Residential Zones	Oppose	Increase land coverage to 70%.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 6
S169.001	Andrew Dunlop	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S169.002	Andrew Dunlop	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S169.003	Andrew Dunlop	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S169.009	Andrew Dunlop	Residential Zones	Not Stated	Being able to build [up to] 80% site coverage on Residential Zone sites.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 6
S169.010	Andrew Dunlop	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Seek to retain] Daylight angles that are used under the [Nelson Resource Management Plan]	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S170.001	Owen Dunlop	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S170.002	Owen Dunlop	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S170.003	Owen Dunlop	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S170.009	Owen Dunlop	Residential Zones	Oppose	I want to see the current daylight angles [in the Nelson Resource Management Plan] retained in PC29	I oppose all daylight angles in PC29.	Reject	Section 6
S170.010	Owen Dunlop	Residential Zones	Not Stated	Increase site coverage to 80%.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 6

S171.001	Graham Pomeroy	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. The loss of sunlight on our solar panels.	Reject	Section 6
S171.002	Graham Pomeroy	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. The loss of sunlight on our solar panels.	Reject	Section 6
S171.003	Graham Pomeroy	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. The loss of sunlight on our solar panels.	Reject	Section 6
S172.001	John Sandston	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S172.002	John Sandston	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S172.003	John Sandston	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S173.001	Leigh Davies	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres. Build further away from all boundaries.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. Building within 1 metre of all boundaries impedes not only sunlight but daylight and reduced privacy.	Reject	Section 6

S173.002	Leigh Davies	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres. Build further away from all boundaries.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. Building within 1 metre of all boundaries impedes not only sunlight but daylight and reduced privacy.	Reject	Section 6
S173.003	Leigh Davies	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres. Build further away from all boundaries.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. Building within 1 metre of all boundaries impedes not only sunlight but daylight and reduced privacy.	Reject	Section 6
S174.001	David Jack	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S174.002	David Jack	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S174.003	David Jack	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S175.001	Alton Street Heritage Precinct	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S175.002	Alton Street Heritage Precinct	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S175.003	Alton Street Heritage Precinct	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S177.001	Peter McNae	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S177.002	Peter McNae	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S177.003	Peter McNae	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S177.010	Peter McNae	Residential Zones	Oppose	Greater site coverage.	Not stated.	Accept in part	Section 6
S178.001	Tony No surname supplied	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S178.002	Tony No surname supplied	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S178.003	Tony No surname supplied	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S179.001	Raymond Ikink	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S179.002	Raymond Ikink	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S179.003	Raymond Ikink	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S180.001	Geoff Cooper	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S180.002	Geoff Cooper	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S180.003	Geoff Cooper	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S181.001	John Towns	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S181.002	John Towns	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S181.003	John Towns	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S182.001	Ellen Stewart	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. Sunlight also contributes to well-being. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 6
S182.002	Ellen Stewart	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. Sunlight also contributes to well-being. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 6
S182.003	Ellen Stewart	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. Sunlight also contributes to well-being. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 6
S183.001	Sandra Hunter	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency and mental health benefits.	Reject	Section 6
S183.002	Sandra Hunter	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency and mental health benefits.	Reject	Section 6
S183.003	Sandra Hunter	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency and mental health benefits.	Reject	Section 6
S184.001	Barbara Amohanga	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S184.002	Barbara Amohanga	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S184.003	Barbara Amohanga	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S185.001	Stuart Yank	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S185.002	Stuart Yank	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S185.003	Stuart Yank	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S185.009	Stuart Yank	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Seek to have] every plan scrutinised by the Planning Department with consultation with all affectedneighbours in the area to assess any	I believe not enough care will be taken as regards neighbours sunlight accessibility.	Reject	*Section 6*
S186.001	Donna Harris	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S186.002	Donna Harris	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S186.003	Donna Harris	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S187.001	Lisa-Maria Perkins	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. If we allow 3-6 storey buildings in residential areas the effects on neighbours will be detrimental to the long term environmental objectives for Nelson. The proposed areas are either already cold due to being on the South side or poorly insulated houses. [Use of] electricity and other unsustainable heating methods will increase.	Reject	Section 6
S187.002	Lisa-Maria Perkins	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. If we allow 3-6 storey buildings in residential areas the effects on neighbours will be detrimental to the long term environmental objectives for Nelson. The proposed areas are either already cold due to being on the South side or poorly insulated houses. [Use of] electricity and other unsustainable heating methods will increase.	Reject	Section 6
S187.003	Lisa-Maria Perkins	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S188.001	Sue Cunningham	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S188.002	Sue Cunningham	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S188.003	Sue Cunningham	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S189.001	Anton Hyman	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S189.002	Anton Hyman	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S189.003	Anton Hyman	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S191.001	Michael Rhoades	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S191.002	Michael Rhoades	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S191.003	Michael Rhoades	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S192.001	Jane Jay	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S192.002	Jane Jay	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S192.003	Jane Jay	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S193.004	Denise Hill	Mapping	Oppose	Build in the Kaka Valley down to Maitai.	Refer to reasons in submission point S193.003.	Reject	*Section 6*
S193.006	Denise Hill	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] the existing protection for sunlight to all properties.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties because it is a component of residential amenity in the city and it provides warmth and energy efficiency. Without sunlight and being boxed in, people will suffer depression and mental health issues, as well as not be able to grow anything in their gardens.	Reject	*Section 6*
S193.009	Denise Hill	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules to enable] people to put small, modular homes on their properties to create more housing	Refer to reasons in submission point S193.003.	Reject	*Section 6*
S195.001	Wendy Mansell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Protect existing residents'] right to sunlight.	NZers deserve the right to natural sunlight, which keeps heating costs down and mental health up. NZers are low in Vit D, have high rates of depression and suicide. removing sunlight will increase these major health issues.	Reject	*Section 6*
S197.003	Adrian Parlane	Residential Zones	Amend	[Amend the rules to] require a 1.5m boundary, space for a garden and adequate onsite parking.	For the City in general, I am not opposed to 2 storey 8 metre developments in both General and Medium Density Zones but would require a 1.5m boundary, space for a garden and adequate onsite parking.	Reject	*Section 6*

S197.004	Adrian Parlane	Residential Zones	Amend	[Amend the rules to] 2 storey (8 metre) in the General and Medium Density Zones [and] require a 1.5m boundary, space for a garden and adequate onsite parking.	I am not opposed to 2 storey 8 metre developments in both General and Medium Density Zones but would require a 1.5m boundary, space for a garden and adequate onsite parking. The plan ignores the existing property owners' rights to privacy in their own property as prospective buildings can be 1 metre from the boundary and 3 storeys, 12 metres tall. With no obligation to provide parking there will be a serious increase in demand for street parking. Currently, Stoke has a sensible building footprint to section ratio which allows most of us to maintain a viable garden producing household vegetables and fruit. The proposed plan takes no account of such an important activity.	Reject	*Section 6*
S197.009	Adrian Parlane	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Require] communal gardens to support intensive housing.	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

S198.002	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Amend [the definition of Building] as follows: Building: ~~means~~ any structure, whether temporary or permanent, moveable or immovable, except for: a. any scaffolding or falsework erected temporarily for maintenance or construction purposes, or b. uncovered swimming pools not higher than 1m above natural ground level, or c. fences and walls up to 2m in height, or d. masts, poles, clotheslines, and chimneys less than 1m wide and less than 3m in height above the point of attachment. In the Residential, Inner City, Suburban Commercial and Industrial zones, a building includes a vehicle or motor vehicle (including a vehicle or motor vehicle as defined in section 2(1) of the Land Transport Act 1998) that is ~~immovable~~ not readily movable and is occupied by people on a permanent or long term basis. Or Amend the	Transpower supports the amendments to the definition of "Building" in principle on the basis that they recognise that motor vehicles that are not readily movable, and are occupied on a permanent or long-term basis, can contain activities (such as residential activities) that are sensitive to the national grid. However, Transpower considers a minor amendment is necessary to replace the term "immovable", which presents a high threshold, with "not readily movable". This is consistent with recent observations made by the Environment Court on the matter of whether a home which was on a trailer chassis, but without wheels attached, could be considered as a building or structure because it could not readily be moved from site (see [2023] NZ EnvC 159 Beachen v Auckland Council at [41] through [46]). Transpower does query whether it would be appropriate to amend the definition to reflect that of the National Planning Standards 2019. Such an amendment would be supported. Amend the definition of building to reflect that of the National Planning Standards.	Accept	*Section 6*

S198.003	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Amend as follows: Design Statement is a requirement of Appendix 14 - Residential subdivision design and information requirements and Schedule U Marsden Plateau Landscape Area and is a statement from a suitably qualified and experienced ~~urban design~~ expert that explains the design principles and concepts that have informed the subdivision or development design, and how urban design, ~~and~~ sustainability, and other relevant issues have been dealt with.	The term "Design Statement" also applies to information requirements under Schedule U (Marsden Plateau Landscape Area). The information requirements for a Design Statement under clause U2 of Schedule U are broader than urban design, and include a requirement to demonstrate how all earthworks, buildings, structures and fences proposed to be located within 20m of the high voltage transmission lines traversing the Open Space Areas comply with the minimum safe separation distances outlined in the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice (NZECP) 34:2001. This matter may require expertise beyond that of an urban designer. Because the National Grid passes through the Marsden Plateau Landscape Area, Transpower considers the definition of Design Statement needs to be amended to acknowledge the broader information requirements that apply to Design Statements within the Marsden Plateau Landscape Area.	Accept	*Section 6*
S198.030	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend the policy as follows: Policy RE1.6 general residential zone Increase housing choice and diversity by enabling, where appropriate, a suburban planned built character comprising residential buildings generally up to two storeys, surrounded by open space.	The National Grid is located within parts of the General Residential Zone. Transpower generally supports this policy [RE1.6 general residential zone] on the basis that it provides for a level of development that is appropriate, in combination with the objectives, policies and rules restricting development near the National Grid. However an amendment is sought to recognise that development in all areas it not always appropriate, for example in identified hazard areas or within proximity of the National Grid.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS73.008	EQC Toka Tū Ake		Support	Accept	The submitter (Transpower) suggests an amendment is sought to recognise that development in all areas it not always appropriate, for example in identified hazard areas. We strongly support this submission and support the addition of "where appropriate" for general residential zone housing.	Reject	*Section 6*
S198.031	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend as follows: Policy RE2.8 community benefit It is recognised: that certain non-residential activities need to locate in the Residential Zone, ~~and~~ that some existing nonresidential activities may need to be explicitly provided for in the zone, and that some non-residential activities may enhance the amenity and sense of community of residential areas and will support the social and economic well-being of the local or wider community.	Transpower generally supports the proposed amendments to this policy [RE2.8 community benefit] on the basis that they better recognise that nonresidential activities (such as the National Grid) are necessarily located in the General Residential Zone, and that they will support the social and economic well-being of the community. However, Transpower seeks that the benefits to the wider community are also acknowledged, on the basis that the benefits of some non-residential activities (such as the National Grid) are principally to the wider community (and not just the local community).	Reject	*Section 6*
S200.004	Fiona Perks	Residential Zones	Not Stated	[Request] Rear and Side Yard Setback of not less than 1.5 metres.	Refer to reasons in submission point S200.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S200.007	Fiona Perks	Residential Zones	Not Stated	Consider not only sunlight but privacy, outlook, parking, surrounding character and noise.	Refer to reasons in submission point S200.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S201.003	Pierre Hammond	Residential Zones	Support in part	[Request] review of 3 dwellings maximum prior to Restricted Discretionary.	Design outcomes should not limit a developer from building as many units as per the rules on a building site, this will just restrict development rather than encourage it.	Reject	*Section 6*
S202.001	Patricia Morris	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S202.002	Patricia Morris	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S202.003	Patricia Morris	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S204.002	Ara Poutama Aotearoa, Department of Corrections	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend the definition of residentail activity as follows: Residential activity: means the use of land and buildings by people for living accommodation where the occupiers intend to live at the site for a period of one month or more, and will generally refer to the site as their home and permanent address; and includes accessory buildings and leisure activities. For the purposes of this definition, residential activity (irrespective of the length of stay) shall include: a. accommodation offered to not more than four travellers for a daily tariff in association with a permanent resident as described above, or b. emergency and refuge accommodation, or c. accommodation for supervision staff and residents, where residents are subject to care or supervision (e.g. homes for persons with disabilities, and homes for the elderly)~~, but not for places where residents are subject to detention~~.	To achieve a well-functioning urban environment to meet the community's needs, the relevant NRMP activity definitions must clearly encompass - or at least not exclude - the diverse range of households within communities, including those that serve particular needs. Those activities must be enabled as permitted activities in relevant residential zones. The current definition of "residential activity" in the NRMP reads (emphasis added in brackets): "Residential activity": means the use of land and buildings by people for living accommodation where the occupiers intend to live at the site for a period of one month or more, and will generally refer to the site as their home and permanent address; and includes accessory buildings and leisure activities. For the purposes of this definition, residential activity (irrespective of the length of stay) shall include: a. accommodation offered to not more than four travellers for a daily tariff in association with a permanent resident as described above, or b. emergency and refuge accommodation, or c. accommodation for supervision staff and residents, where residents are subject to care or supervision (e.g. homes for persons with disabilities, and homes for the elderly), but not for places where residents are subject to detention. The definition of "residential activity" specifically excludes places where residents are subject to detention. It is not clear what constitutes "detention" in this definition, as that term is not defined in the NRMP. That creates inherent uncertainty in the kind of accommodation that these exclusions do and do not cover, which can lead to significant issues with, and inconsistencies in, plan administration and interpretation. Recognising that, Ara Poutama has recently sought confirmation from the Council as to whether the proposed use of two residential dwellings containing residents on community-based sentences or orders, together with on-site support and supervision was captured by the definition of "residential activity". The Council	Accept	*Section 6*

FS56.019	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support in part	Accept in part	Kāinga Ora would prefer the use of the standard definition for residential activity provided in the National Planning Standards. The wording in PC29 as drafted is ambiguous, particularly the use of the term 'detention' and the manner in which it may be interpreted in practice. Kāinga Ora supports a non-discriminatory definition which recognises a wide range of households to be provided for in residential zones.	Accept	*Section 6*
S204.003	Ara Poutama Aotearoa, Department of Corrections	Residential Zones	Support	Support the following changes to objective D013A.5 (changes in bold and brackets): Urban development that [supports a well-functioning urban environment and] meets the community's current	Refer to the reasons in submission point S204.001 and the original submission for more detail.	Accept	*Section 6*
S204.004	Ara Poutama Aotearoa, Department of Corrections	Residential Zones	Support	Support the following changes to objective D014.1 (changes in bold and brackets): Subdivision and development [supports a well-functioning urban environment] that recognises and is appropriate to the natural characteristics of the City, [increase housing choice], and is consistent with principles of high	Refer to the reasons in submission point S204.001 and the original submission for more detail.	Accept	*Section 6*
S205.002	Michelle McLean	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend the Plan Change [to] allow taller buildings on the North side of east-west direction streets which are wide (eg Nile, Wainui, Weka) or across from a park (eg Northesk) [and] smaller buildings on North of	Shadow will mostly be on the street or park. Might not make everyone happy but could be something we could all tolerate.	Reject	*Section 6*

S208.001	Katrina Ward	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	• Reject the Plan Change or make amendments so that: there is consideration for pre existing properties before you build walls one metre from boundaries [with potential impacts on] views, daylight, warmth and privacy. people have a say for any development next to their pre existing property.	I oppose the plan change as I think it's unfair to current owners in pre existing neighbourhoods. I would like it noted that while I agree with the fact of having to build upwards instead of outwards and fully support this way forward, I do not like the idea of the council and building companies or big co operations having the right to build beside long standing houses essentially blocking their daylight hours, taking away the sunlight especially in winter when it is most needed and also having the right to build only one metre from the boundry lines. We already do not get good sun in the winter being on the shady side of the Ridgeway and if your plan goes ahead then we are in danger of having our summer sun blocked as well at the front. This means that we would get no sun at any time of the day and at any time of the year. I think that these sorts of things need to be taken into consideration when making these rules as if this plan goes ahead then I can't do anything about it. Not even have my opinion deemed to matter. I also have a wonderful view out towards Richmond over the water that would also be blocked if this went ahead. While I'm pro building upwards and also get the urgency of removing the red tape for housing, I would like it to be taken into consideration houses like mine that could lose all of their value if these changes were to go ahead. At this moment I fear that one day someone is going to be able to come along and build out my view, privacy and warmth and not to forget daylight hours and there would be nothing that I could do about it.	Reject	*Section 6*

S208.002	Katrina Ward	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Reject the Plan Change or make amendments so that: - consideration is given to privacy, outlook and land allocation for community gardens to grow food.	Lastly living where I am I have watched the new builds go up around Coster Street and while they look nice I dont think that plans are taking into consideration the fact of being able to have outside space? What about a little garden so they can grow their own vegetables? Or even a small balcony so they can grow a little bit in pots? There is not even room for community gardens close to these builds. I think that this is important point because if this is the way of the future then more and more of us are going to end up living like this and the idea of not being able to be outside at all or grow our own things is an awful future to imagine.	Reject	*Section 6*
S216.004	Cathie Fearey	Residential Zones	Amend	[Reinstate the] Current daylight angles.	Sunlight is an important reason to live in Nelson and Stoke. The homes in Stoke have been here for years, even decades and they've been built for sun and privacy, creating in general a pleasant healthy ambience. You plonk 3 story buildings here and there throughout your intended medium density zone, you ruin that for a lot of residents.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS5.003	Warwick Rogers		Support	Accept	Daylight is a critical part of peoples well beings. Plan 29 threatens to utterly ruin some peoples live by placing their dwelling in permanent shade.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS32.004	Peter Olorenshaw		Oppose in part	Reject in part	Nelsust provided a solution to transition to townhouse zones by keeping the daylight over regulations for Southern boundaries, but allowing people to build 2 stories high up to their Northern boundaries. (and once someone has built up to your Southern Boundary 2 stories high, you can do the same) This maintains SUNlight into neighbouring properties but enables the transition to 2 story townhouses up the boundaries.	Reject	*Section 6*

S216.005	Cathie Fearey	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Require] a minimum land area of 400-600m2 per dwelling. Green space public park areas, and minimum distance to boundary: 1.5, 2,2,2 m [sic] for new development.	[Prioritize] quality of life and healthy homes for our kids to grow up in and attractive and healthy neighborhoods that have sun and green spaces.	Reject	*Section 6*
S218.002	Hugh Walton and Louise Trevathan	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Enable] well designed social housing at appropriate locations in buildings of up to three stories with appropriate amenities and facilities, adequate car parking and recreations spaces; provided full account is taken of loss of sunshine hours or privacy from nearly existing houses and no associated potential loss of value.	We have absolutely no objection at all to well-planned and designed social housing and apartments of up to three stories at appropriate locations... The Plan 29 proposal has a potential dramatic impact on nearly housing sunshine and privacy loss and depreciated property values. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S218.008	Hugh Walton and Louise Trevathan	Residential Zones	Amend	[Ensure] every apartment has a well-appointed balcony.	Refer to reasons in submission point S218.002.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S218.012	Hugh Walton and Louise Trevathan	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: • Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. • Reduced level of physical well being • Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. • Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. • Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. • Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. • Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. • Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S218.013	Hugh Walton and Louise Trevathan	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S218.012.	Accept	*Section 6*
S218.014	Hugh Walton and Louise Trevathan	Residential Zones	Support in part	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*

S218.017	Hugh Walton and Louise Trevathan	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S218.019	Hugh Walton and Louise Trevathan	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S218.032	Hugh Walton and Louise Trevathan	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S218.031.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S222.001	Lesley Kotua	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S222.002	Lesley Kotua	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S222.003	Lesley Kotua	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S226.001	Nigel and Angela Tideman	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S226.002	Nigel and Angela Tideman	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S226.003	Nigel and Angela Tideman	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S227.001	Sophia Katsoulis	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S227.002	Sophia Katsoulis	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S227.003	Sophia Katsoulis	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S228.001	Derek Gray	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S228.002	Derek Gray	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S228.003	Derek Gray	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S229.001	Hamish Sellers	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S229.002	Hamish Sellers	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S229.003	Hamish Sellers	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S230.001	Steven Judge	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S230.002	Steven Judge	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S230.003	Steven Judge	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S230.009	Steven Judge	Residential Zones	Oppose	Only up to 2 storey in residential zone and with conditions for sunlight for neighbouring properties	All homes need sunlight all year round.	Reject	*Section 6*
S231.002	Greg West	Residential Zones	Amend	Seeking no minimum site/size. Seeking [a] minimum 1.5m road boundary set back. [Seeking a minimum] 1.5m front and 1m side [yard set backs]. [Seeking a minimum outlook space of] 4mx4m [for] living areas and 1mx1m [for] bedrooms. [Seeking a minimum]	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

S235.001	Kathryn Basalaj	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the allowable building] height and [change the] areas [to be developed to be] away from existing houses.	I oppose the building heights, light planes and onsite parking issues. I believe the intensification plans will destroy Nelson's unique character which we all value and is why we choose to live here. It is unfair to families who have worked hard to buy their family homes then to enable developers buy neighbouring homes to build dwellings up to four and 6 levels. There is no consideration towards Residents. This is WRONG! These will create a huge amount of cars needing somewhere to park. We are short on parking already. These buildings will take away most or all of the sunlight which imperative for healthy living. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S235.004	Kathryn Basalaj	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Seek to] put large apartments in areas such as Kawai St South where there are several state owned houses with very large sections on unused land.	If some of these large dwellings are for social housing, families will have to put up with excessive noise, drugs, alcohol and parties which sadly always go hand in hand with these types of housing. Why not put these large apartments in areas such as Kawai St South where there are several state owned houses with very large sections on unused land. These would be close to schools, parks, and shops and not destroy our beautiful neighbourhoods in the CBD and outskirts.	Accept	*Section 6*
S239.001	Kyra Wilkie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S239.002	Kyra Wilkie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S239.003	Kyra Wilkie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S239.014	Kyra Wilkie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Support] 2 storey development as infill housing as long as its environmentally sympathetic and there are still green spaces between buildings.	2 storey development as infill housing is okay as long as its environmentally sympathetic and there are still green spaces between buildings.	Accept	*Section 6*
S240.001	Peter Wilkie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. Heating costs will increase if daylight hours are affected.	Reject	Section 6
S240.002	Peter Wilkie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. Heating costs will increase if daylight hours are affected.	Reject	Section 6
S240.003	Peter Wilkie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. Heating costs will increase if daylight hours are affected.	Reject	Section 6
S241.001	Amanda Dykzeul	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S241.002	Amanda Dykzeul	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S241.003	Amanda Dykzeul	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S242.001	Greg and Amanda Dykzeul	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S242.002	Greg and Amanda Dykzeul	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S242.003	Greg and Amanda Dykzeul	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S246.001	Connie Sellers	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S246.002	Connie Sellers	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S246.003	Connie Sellers	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S247.016	David Turpin	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the creation of High, Medium and General Residential zones, and specifically the heights, sunlight angles and dwelling numbers proposed.	The loss of sunlight from houses and sections not only has a huge affect on people's health, by lack of sunlight for gardens, sunny outside areas, sunlight into the house, it means the use of sustainable renewable energy is lost from solar. The lack of privacy with high rise units looking directly into people's private property. Refer also to the reasons in S247.001.	Reject	*Section 6*

S247.018	David Turpin	Residential Zones	Oppose		Consider the following proposal as an alternative to Plan Change 29: All residential areas to have the same rules. Maximum non consented building height of 8.5m. With an absolute height of 11 m if resource consent is applied for. Current daylight angles will remain, meaning Neighbour sign off for reduced sunlight and extra height must be required. All resources consents to have neighbouring consultation. City Centre district/area to have a maximum height of 11m or (3-4 stories). With an absolute height of 14m under resource consent application. Industrial/commercial zones to have the same restrictions. All residential areas to be allowed 2 dwellings per title. as long as it conforms to daylight angles, height	I am currently in Boulder Colorado which has a population of 100k and has a very similar feel to Nelson. Yet they have strong restrictions on heritage and they also don't have building heights as plan29 proposes. Their city centre is beautiful and would max at 3-4 stories and most are 2-3. I have taken lots of photos of both Boulder and Denver city. Refer also to the reasons in S247.001. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

FS28.119	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Consider the following proposal as an alternative to Plan Change 29: • All residential areas to have the same rules. • Maximum non consented building height of 8.5m. With an absolute height of 11 m if resource consent is applied for. • Current daylight angles will remain, meaning Neighbour sign off for reduced sunlight and extra height must be required. • All resource consents to have neighbouring consultation. • City Centre district/area to have a maximum height of 11m or (3-4 stories). With an absolute height of 14m under resource consent. Industrial/commercial zones to have the same restrictions. • All residential areas to be allowed 2 dwellings per title. as long as it conforms to daylight angles, height restrictions and ground coverage of 40%. • Any extra height or dwelling must go through resource consent and will require Neighbour sign off. Minimum subdivision and section size m². No offstreet parking required. • Heritage protection on all existing heritage zones. More talk required for extra heritage houses/ buildings to be added. Reasons: The Tahunanui (flat) and Monaco residential areas are largely outside the PC29 boundaries and comprise either standard residential or low-density zoning. Applying the same residential zoning/rules across all existing residential zones and providing for up to 2 residential units per site as a permitted activity i.e. residential intensification, is not appropriate, in particular within those areas subject to the Nelson Airport Overlays.	Reject	*Section 6*

S248.001	Mani Gardwell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Request] Council keep regulations regarding preservation of sunlight to neighbours.	Sunlight is essential to warm homes. Our house is single glazed but gets lots of direct sunlight in the Winter. This is our source of heating. This is a common situation in Nelson. Homes that don't get Winter sun are cold, dark and damp. Children are more likely to get asthma and other health issues. We cannot afford to double glaze or pay for heating all day every day in the Winter. To do this to ordinary Nelson families is immoral. There are plenty of options to increase housing supply. Two-story town houses increase supply without ruining the well being of Nelson families.	Reject	*Section 6*
S256.001	Diana Fors	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S256.002	Diana Fors	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S256.003	Diana Fors	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S261.003	William Freeman	Mapping	Oppose	Do not allow more than 2 storeys on Wakefield Quay/SH 6 - and escarpment overlooking that road [see the submission attachment for the defined area].	Objective D02.2 (natural hazards) not achieved. Accept Objective is to recognize and avoid significant risks from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure. "Natural hazard" includes slope instability and objective is to ensure 'activities' do not occur where there is potential for injury to persons or 'significant' damage to property and infrastructure when the natural hazard could be avoided or mitigated through management of the activity. Accepted the first step, is to identity areas susceptible to natural hazards (D02.2.1) by way of overlays on planning maps. But submitted that has not fully occurred. There is evidence of numerous slips along SH 6/Wakefield Quay and the potential for slips to occur in the future. See map attached to the submission for details of slips to date (slips marked with black dots as seen by submitter). The additional weight of 2+ storeys could transfer instability to the land below any such building. To allow intensification/development along the top of the escarpment could lead to further instability of the escarpment, particularly if multiple houses are permitted - and if so, the weight of those houses could lead to further instability of the escarpment. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S262.001	Sarah Digges La Touche	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S262.002	Sarah Digges La Touche	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S262.003	Sarah Digges La Touche	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S262.011	Sarah Digges La Touche	Residential Zones	Oppose	Low rise (no more than 3 storeys high) pepper pot infill housing with supported parking, throughout Nelson would be a more integrative approach to Nelson's housing situation.	High rise community housing has been proven in numerous countries throughout the world to be unsustainable and socially disadvantageous. Habitat for humanities model for additional housing appears to be integrative and sustainable. Nelson is a tourism town and the people of Nelson do not support high rise housing. Do not allow short sighted, limited planning, to ruin Nelson City.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS28.128	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Low rise (no more than 3 storeys high) pepper pot infill housing with supported parking, throughout Nelson would be a more integrative approach to Nelson's housing situation. Providing for residential infill housing to occur (presumably as a permitted activity) throughout a range of zones within Nelson would risk allowing for residential intensification in areas where this is not appropriate e.g. areas subject to the Nelson Airport Overlays.	Reject	*Section 6*
S264.001	Dharan Longley	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S264.002	Dharan Longley	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S264.003	Dharan Longley	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S266.001	Luke Slotemaker	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S266.002	Luke Slotemaker	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S266.003	Luke Slotemaker	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S268.001	Richard Palmer	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. It is a major fact that sunlight has a psychological benefit to prevent depression, Sunlight keeps me warm, saves money, and makes me happy.	Reject	Section 6
S268.002	Richard Palmer	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. It is a major fact that sunlight has a psychological benefit to prevent depression, Sunlight keeps me warm, saves money, and makes me happy.	Reject	Section 6
S268.003	Richard Palmer	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. It is a major fact that sunlight has a psychological benefit to prevent depression, Sunlight keeps me warm, saves money, and makes me happy.	Reject	Section 6

S269.007	Lew Metcalfe	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] only the rules and their status that are required by government legislation, with all other rules for the construction of multi-storey residential developments within all Residential Zones to [have a status of] Discretionary Activities or Non-Complying and [require these] applications to be Notified.	While legislation requires Council to include certain Permitted Activities and possibly some Restricted Activities (Medium Density Residential Standards & RMA Enabling Housing Supply Act 2021) in the Rules, there is opportunity to ensure a full assessment of the effects of intensification are considered and subject to community scrutiny. One of primary community fears is that PC29 unduly constrains or possibly negates public input to multi-storey development under PC29 in a residential zone and that Council doesn't have the ability to manage potential effects on behalf of the community either. This leaves individual residents and the community vulnerable to the wishes and needs of a developer. Making as many rules as possible with a Discretionary or Non-Complying status is necessary to even the playing field and to ensure all relevant matters are thoroughly considered before a consent is issued for new residential intensification. That PC29 is an "interim" response, that demand is considered low and that there has been no neighbourhood planning (ie; very little engaged community input to date) strengthens the need for rules and policies that require all new residential housing developments to be rigorously considered by Council and the community through the "Notified" consent process.	Reject	*Section 6*
S269.009	Lew Metcalfe	Residential Zones	Oppose	Include a rule for multi-storey residential applications in the GRZ requiring applicants to provide an analysis of the social and amenity well-being impacts of the development	Refer to the reasons in submission point S269.008.	Reject	*Section 6*

S270.006	Nicola Horner	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. Our larger sections in the suburb of Stoke are long and narrow, developers will build vertically on the section blocking sunlight and all privacy will disappear on sections either side. If you go ahead with plan 29 my suggestion is to remove the one blanket rule. What might work well on the large area on the 81 Neale ave section, will not work around the general areas of Stoke.	Reject	Section 6
S271.001	Garry Pettersson	Mapping	Amend	Rezone the Properties at 102 Tasman Street and 353 Hardy Street from Residential Standard Zone to General Residential Zone.	With Councils objective of increased residential intensification these two sites would enable a modest form of intensification with a upgrade of zoning and the lower minimum site permitted in the GRZ. The reasons being these sites: 1. Do not have any flood overlays imposed. 2. Are in close proximity to the inner city. 3. There are examples in the proposed Plan Change where change of zones is not dependent on being in ' Blocks'. 4. The rest of the Block have some form of flood overlay on their land and appear to be reasonably zoned. 5. To have the two properties zoned General Residential zone it would be a compatible transition from the high density zoned land on the south side of Hardy Street to Standard Residential Zone for the other properties in the block.	Reject	*Section 6 and the Natural Hazards report*

S272.004	Bruno Allais	Residential Zones	Oppose	Reduce the use of discretionary and restricted discretionary activities in the General, Medium and High Density zones.	The use of the building consent process could allow construction in excess of the permitted dimensions, which are already a source of concern for residents. So what greater level of concern should they have if an extension to the height, floor area or number rule is added without their knowledge? Couldn't the cases subject to discretionary planning be reduced to certain conditions, such as a minimum land size or a specific location within each zone? [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S272.005	Bruno Allais	Mapping	Not Stated	[Ensure that zoning] accounts for the mainly two storey architecture and the current quality of many intimate, balanced and planted blocks, and existing buildings.	The planned intensification will be done on an already existing fixed plan, that of the town's current lots and streets. PC29 plan does not anticipate any eventual regrouping of lots (for example, to encourage a particular operation that does not allow a small section), or any transformation of streets. In addition, the regulations are applied equally to the entirety of each zone (G, M or H density), with no nuances regarding the character of the different blocks within each zone. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S274.007	Robert Renshaw	Residential Zones	Oppose	Request that Council does not make any changes to Daylight angles in residnetial areas [by] maintain[ing] the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S274.008	Robert Renshaw	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S274.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S274.009	Robert Renshaw	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S274.012	Robert Renshaw	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Plan] new subdivisions to include a mix of taller buildings as well as single storey houses [and ensure] taller buildings are not impeding on the sunlight of the lower buildings	Not stated.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S274.015	Robert Renshaw	Residential Zones	Oppose	Allow development that complies with the current rules and fits in with the nature of surrounding properties.	There are many large sections in residential areas that could be subdivided but they should only allow for development that complies with the current rules and fits in with the nature of the surrounding properties, this will also increase intensification.	Accept	*Section 6*
S276.001	Jo Murphy	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S276.002	Jo Murphy	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S276.003	Jo Murphy	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S276.009	Jo Murphy	Residential Zones	Oppose	Permission from landowners around such developments must be obtained. Landowners around such developments must be subsidised for the decrease in property value.	Many properties were purchased at the peak of the property market. Social housing developments will negatively affect the value of these properties. It is also a concern that such developments will take place in elderly populated areas such as Stoke. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S278.003	Paul Lunberg	Mapping	Not Stated	If the Council is hell-bent on increasing our population then consider greater density housing near the new developments near the Mitre10 Mega store and/or between Nayland Road and Annesbrook drive/Main Road Stoke	Not stated.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S280.014	Nicola Gabelich	Residential Zones	Amend	Consider smaller rule changes to enable housing intensification of one - two stories in height.	Low Rise intensification. Already there are some examples of cleverly designed housing intensification on existing sites in Nelson that are only one -two stories high. [Corner of Totara and Vanguard Streets, Corner of Tasman and Grove Streets, 64 Waverly Street Richmond, and 116 Queens Drive, Lyall Bay, Wellington] These show that it is possible to intensify housing in a positive way, under the existing city planning rules. Perhaps some smaller rule changes could also be considered to enable more of these style of developments to occur, to gently and sympathetically intensify the existing suburbs. I have attached photos of several recent development as examples. One is in Richmond, rather than Nelson, but is a great example of what would work well in Nelson also. [Refer to the original submission for more detail and pictures of the developments listed above].	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S284.003	Alison and David Mountfort	Residential Zones	Oppose	That any applications for intensive development should be notified to affected neighbours.	We consider that if this zoning is confirmed it would enable a large development capacity as of right. Inevitably this will have adverse effects on neighbours, for all the reasons we have described and possibly for other reasons. Therefore we believe any applications for intensive development should be notified to affected neighbours. Refer to reasons in submission points S284.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S287.001	Wendy Ford	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. The daylight effect of living in shadow will impair people's mental health.	Reject	Section 6
S287.002	Wendy Ford	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. The daylight effect of living in shadow will impair people's mental health.	Reject	Section 6
S287.003	Wendy Ford	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. The daylight effect of living in shadow will impair people's mental health.	Reject	Section 6
S287.009	Wendy Ford	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Inclusion of the neighbours affected through current processes].	The blanket approach of mass selecting areas is a very disingenuous way to try and tackle the housing problem. The systems in place do work. We have multi-level buildings in existence. It can be built with the inclusion of the neighbours affected through the current processes.	Reject	*Section 6*
S288.001	Savanna Lovesey	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S288.002	Savanna Lovesey	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S288.003	Savanna Lovesey	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S289.001	Orlando Lovesey	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S289.002	Orlando Lovesey	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S289.003	Orlando Lovesey	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S299.003	Rose Sorren-Norness	Residential Zones	Amend	[Increase] the General Residential Zone height to three stories, 12 meters.	The area that zoned as general residential should share in the distribution of population growth. I believe this area is not being considered due to liquefaction, but there are numerous examples in cities in NZ where there are building much higher being built on land prone to liquifaction.	Reject	*Section 6*
S300.003	Kenneth Norness Jr	Residential Zones	Amend	[Increase] the General Residential Zone height to three stories, 12 meters.	The area that zoned as general residential should share in the distribution of population growth. I believe this area is not being considered due to liquefaction, but there are numerous examples in cities in NZ where there are building much higher being built on land prone to liquefaction.	Reject	*Section 6*
S301.003	Lyndon Chandler	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Do not change day light angles.	Refer to reasons in submission point S301.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

S306.001	Chris Phillips	Residential Zones	Support in part	[Support] allowing up to 3 dwellings on a site.	The one part I think you have right is the idea of allowing up to 3 dwellings on a site.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS38.002	Small Time Developments		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: [Support] allowing up to 3 dwellings on a site. The 3 dwellings rule is a key one for opening opportunities for affordable housing.	Reject	*Section 6*

S308.002	Michael Potter	Residential Zones	Support in part	Consider incentivising developments meeting Lifemark Level 4 standards or higher on a similar basis to the Wellington Council Environmental and Accessibility Performance Fund.	We are concerned that the requirements for 'micro-mobility' access on sites that do not have vehicle access to a site, including step free options (D1/D2 as specified in NZS 4121 design for access and mobility) do not go far enough to meet the needs of an aging population including increased physical and sensory disabilities. The Building Act 2004, currently does not require lift access for 3 level dwellings unless 50 people or more reside on the 3rd floor of multi-unit site. We would like to see Council put aside funding to incentivise developers who utilise Universal Design Standards to Level 4 or higher, as is already the case in Wellington. Universal Design Standards are legislated in Ireland, London (for social and public housing), Norway (for both public buildings and residential housing) and other jurisdictions. In Australia the Federal Building Code change in September 2022 is based on Universal Building Design Standards in recognition of a population that is aging and has more disabilities. Incentivising the use of Universal Design Standards gives developers a reason to build housing more suited to the needs of Nelson's future population and support Plan Change 29 to grow resilient communities. Universal Design Standards enable people to age in their homes, as a house can be readily adapted to meet the needs of a change in mobility or loss of health, for example wet area bathroom with a shower seat and rails in the case of a stroke or cancer. Housing modifications in a home without Universal Design Standards are typically over 15% of the original cost. Additionally they take longer, with occupants having to move out of the home for an extended period, all of which adds additional costs and stress on top of reduced wellbeing outcomes. The burden of not using Universal Design is particularly acute in Social Housing, Public Housing and rented accommodation where tenure is not guaranteed, choices are scarce and government/social housing providers face	Reject	*Section 6*

S308.007	Michael Potter	Residential Zones	Support in part	Require all lower floor apartments and single storey housing to comply with universal design standards using design guides as a minimum starting point.	Universal Design Standards enable people to age in their homes, as a house can be readily adapted to meet the needs of a change in mobility or loss of health, for example wet area bathroom with a shower seat and rails in the case of a stroke or cancer. Housing modifications in a home without Universal Design Standards are typically over 15% of the original cost. Additionally they take longer, with occupants having to move out of the home for an extended period, all of which adds additional costs and stress on top of reduced wellbeing outcomes. We believe Plan Change 29 could go further, requiring all lower floor apartments and single storey housing to comply with universal design standards using design guides as a minimum starting point.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S311.001	Derek Nees	Residential Zones	Amend	Remove the word "Daylight" and insert "Sunlight".	This proposal is not about "daylight" - it is about "Sunlight". Plants don't grow and people become sickly if they do not get reasonable exposure to Sunlight. Under the current proposal it would be allowable for a structure next door to exclude us and our property from access to "Sunshine" hours. We have already had experience of our property being excessively shaded by a large tree - We see an extension to that shading with the planned allowable buildings.	Reject	*Section 6*
S312.006	Diane Rose	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings be built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	We are opposed to new 'green field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification without affecting existing suburbs. Infrastructure is easier and cheaper to develop on flat land and would provide more housing without affecting neighbouring properties.	Reject	*Section 6*

S312.008	Diane Rose	Residential Zones	Oppose	Include Daylight and Sunlight policy statement Para RE2.3.i: The reception of daylight and sunlight to each household unit is a critical component of residential amenity that provides warmth and energy efficiency, and is vital for outdoor activities such as gardening and recreation.	Sunlight is an essential part of living in Nelson and why we chose to live on the Tāhunanui Hills. Our house has been built for the sun and for the garden to receive sun. It will be subjected to the loss of sunlight by neighbouring intensification with the following possible effects: All 5 edges of our property could have 6 story high apartments one metre from the boundary completely enclosed our property in a very high box of buildings. This could compromise our health. Hill properties like ours already have additional shading issues directly from the hill which is another reason for not having high density development on hills. The lack of sunlight could result in existing homes becoming dark and damp with associated mould and mildew. Our house could lose property value if it is surrounded on all sides by apartments. We still have a mortgage so there will be increased financial stress if this is to occur. Privacy and outlook is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S314.003	Gardner/Mitchell Group	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Amend the Yard Setbacks to require buildings to be set back 1.5m from side and rear boundaries with no exceptions	Refer to reasons in submission point S314.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S314.004	Gardner/Mitchell Group	Residential Zones	Support in part	Require the minimum of 20% Permeable Landscape area in all new residential zones to have a landscape approved design.	Permeable Landscape area: All new residential zones to have a minimum 20% of site to be a permeable landscape approved design Refer to reasons in submission point S314.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S314.006	Gardner/Mitchell Group	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Include a design standard in the restricted discretionary criteria for [rules REr.17B, REr.18B and REr.19B for] 4 or more residential units in the residential zones [inferred]	Refer to reasons in submission point S314.001.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S316.001	Kim Odendaal	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Restrict buildings to] 1 story in established neighbourhoods.	Due to the natural hazards in the area and already established neighborhoods, I am against any building being more that 1 story high. Anything higher impacts entitlement to quiet enjoyment as homeowners privacy would be removed (people looking down into private properties), reduction of open sky view as well as a reduction in sunlight. Lack of good faith - my whole life savings is tied up in my property, and the Councils decision could severely reduce my investment, affecting my to retirement and enjoyment of life.	Reject	*Section 6*
S317.001	Rosa Coutts	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S317.002	Rosa Coutts	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S317.003	Rosa Coutts	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S318.001	James Greeks	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S318.002	James Greeks	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S318.003	James Greeks	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S319.001	Pauline Jones	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S319.002	Pauline Jones	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S319.003	Pauline Jones	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S322.005	Cathy Nicholson	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Include encouragement and the ability for existing homeowners to add units to their property which are low profile, and affordably priced. These could include units that are removable if circumstances change	Currently we have issues with affordable rent for many people in our community. Many of the residential Units that will be developed under PC 29 will not be affordable.	Accept	*Section 6*
S323.002	Sue Thomas	Mapping	Oppose	Rezone the Washington Valley area/zone to General Residential Zone.	Refer to reasons in submission point S323.001.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
FS83.034	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support in part	Accept in part	Submitter has vast heritage knowledge and reading their submission on Nelson Heritage listings was concerning and shows the total lack of research, consultation, competence or care by NCC with the PC29.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S324.002	Zero Carbon Nelson Tasman	Residential Zones	Amend	Increase tree-covered areas in the urban landscape and all paving on suburban sections to be permeable.	We endorse more permeable paving, and would support all paving on suburban sections to be permeable. We would like to see more consideration of increased tree-covered areas in the urban landscape to add to the shade, cooling and permeability of the urban area.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S325.001	Ken Clapcott	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S325.002	Ken Clapcott	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S325.003	Ken Clapcott	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S328.002	Hanni Kaspar	Residential Zones	Amend	Change daylight admission to sunlight admission and update recession planes accordingly in the High, Medium and General Residential zones.	It is sunlight, not daylight, which seems to be good for physical and mental health. It doesn't make sense to build so densely that lack of enough direct sunlight into our living spaces leads to mood problems.	Reject	*Section 6*
S328.008	Hanni Kaspar	Residential Zones	Amend	On hills allow for terraced housing units (not townhouses), stepping up/down the slope in the General Residential zone and Medium Density Residential zone where applicable.	Stepped housing is a high density form of building. The foundations of housing stepped along a slope can be engineered to stabilise the slope. Stepped housing units on a slope interfere far less with sunlight and views than free standing 3 storey-ed buildings positioned close to each other.	Accept	Section 6

S329.007	Inea Yoon	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission [Nelson Resource Management Plan] protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S329.008	Inea Yoon	Residential Zones	Support	Support the inclusion of [policy RE2.3 Daylight and Sunlight and associated explanation and reasons]	Refer to reasons in submission point S329.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S329.009	Inea Yoon	Residential Zones	Amend	[Amend policy RE2.4.ii as follows:] The Building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units [and their neighbours] have a reasonable degree of privacy as well as	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property. I support the inclusion of RE2.4.iii, but ask Council to add the following [bracketed] words.	Reject	*Section 6*
S329.012	Inea Yoon	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S329.014	Inea Yoon	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 [residential] units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*

S329.027	Inea Yoon	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Require] Council working closely with Kainga Ora, to provide a 'transparent' way of creating new Social Housing Developments that 'Fit' with the long-term design vision of Nelson.	Significant care and attention must be considered with all social housing because there are too many examples across the country where this has resulted in disharmony in communities. High density living for the homeless and vulnerable will not result in healthy outcomes for all concerned. Careful design controls from the concept stage onwards, will be rewarded in the long run, with less support required by Mental Health Services, Charity Services, Police and Social Services.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S330.002	Jennifer Pomeroy	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Redraft plan 29 so that daylight angles are unchanged.	Refer to the reasons in S330.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S334.004	Fiona Hosie	Residential Zones	Oppose	Amendment of PC29 to ensure that all recession planes (and commencement height and degree angles) remain as detailed in the NRMP.	I oppose the inclusion of recession planes (in any residential zone) which commence at a height or angle greater than provided in the current NRMP. I bought my home in an area where I knew that there was existing legal protection of residential amenities (in particular as to height and sunlight); and I reasonably expect that to continue. I oppose the absence of any detailed comment as to the visual and amenity effect on neighbouring properties of permitted height of 19.5 metres and recession plane only commencing at 12 metres.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS5.021	Warwick Rogers		Support	Accept	Plan 29 is a total mess of an idea that tramples on the rights of thousands of hard working rate payers and will negatively the well being of thousands.	Reject	*Section 6*
S334.011	Fiona Hosie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend] the proposed plan change to ensure that the expression "the ability to achieve the planned built character of the zone" (and similar expressions) be removed.	I oppose the inclusion of the Rules of all provisions that mean that the "planned built character of the zone" is of equal (or more) importance than (and therefore trumps) the negative effect which a proposed (non fully compliant) building and/or development would have on adjoining sites.	Reject	*Section 6*

S338.002	Tim Morrison	Residential Zones	Not Stated	Maintain the existing Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	One of the effects of the proposed PC29 is that property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section, with affordable additional units that could be over shadowed and devalued by a wealthier developer who could afford to build a multi-storey development next door at any time in the future. This will limit the intensification desired by Council.	Reject	*Section 6*
S338.004	Tim Morrison	Mapping	Oppose	Apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district.	I ask Council to apply the new and amended General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district on the introduction of PC29, on the basis that existing Daylight Admission protection rules will apply to all pre- existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS28.009	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Apply new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson District. The Tahunanui (flat) and Monaco residential areas are largely outside the PC29 boundaries and comprise either standard residential or low-density zoning. Applying a general residential zoning across all existing residential zones would provide for up to 3 residential units per site as a permitted activity. However, there are a number of areas that are not appropriate for further residential intensification, in particular those areas subject to the Nelson Airport Overlays.	Accept	*Section 6*

S338.006	Tim Morrison	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	I am strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single Storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilization of land that can accommodate increased intensification. Larger Green Field developments offer the best opportunity for intensification which can be designed such that neighbouring properties are minimally affected. I note that buyers of properties in such new developments will be purchasing with knowledge of how adjacent development affects them, and this will no doubt be reflected in the reduced value of the land and other adverse effects will have been implicitly accepted by the purchaser.	Reject	*Section 6*
S339.003	Mark Alderson	Residential Zones	Amend	Retain the current sunshine/ daylight angles.	Nelson is the Sunshine city attracting families from all over the world. They come for a better quality of life and living. We have all seen the negative impact of high density in other towns and cities not only in New Zealand but across the world. People choose to move to cities like Nelson because of the light and space it provides, thanks to its current building regulations. In many places across the world high density housing, in particular tall buildings (buildings over 11 meters) are being removed. All housing should enhance current neighborhoods and not overshadow them. Current sunshine/daylight angles were created to enhance the quality of people's lives. This can still be achieved with proper planning.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS78.461	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission I support are: various. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences; amenity and value in the CBD and residential areas will be lost if it goes ahead.	Reject	*Section 6*

S339.005	Mark Alderson	Residential Zones	Amend	Incorporate provisions that prioritize accessible and affordable housing options particularly for vulnerable and marginalized populations.	While considering changes to our city's planning, it is imperative that the social housing needs of our community are addressed comprehensively. Our city's character is enriched by its diversity, and ensuring a range of housing options will contribute to a more inclusive and equitable society. The documentation provided with the Draft Plan Change 29 does not address this issue, merely the number of additional housing units that could be added.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS78.464	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission I support are: various. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences; amenity and value in the CBD and residential areas will be lost if it goes ahead.	Reject	*Section 6*
S340.020	John Hugo	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Carefully evaluate any proposed development's height and area to prevent overshadowing, loss of privacy, and disruptions to the existing urban landscape; Ensuring that new developments blend harmoniously with the surrounding environment and adhere to established guidelines.	Excessive Height and Area of Development: Any proposed development's height and area must be carefully evaluated to prevent overshadowing, loss of privacy, and disruptions to the existing urban landscape. Ensuring that new developments blend harmoniously with the surrounding environment and adhere to established guidelines is crucial for maintaining the character of our city. I cannot understand the need for 6 (six) storey developments on 200 (two hundred) square metre sections in the current residential areas. Three storey townhouse style development around open spaces would make more sense in residential areas currently proposed as HDZ. Check out 5/25 Latimer Square in Christchurch as an example of a comfortable 3 (three) storey home in a well planned development. I can see a future in Nelson and for Nelson if this sort of 3 storey townhouse planning were implemented as the HDZ.	Reject	*Section 6*

S343.002	Mark Fielding	Residential Zones	Amend	Maximize and promote the use of Secondary Minor Dwellings on existing residential properties. without a Resource Consent [with the associated changes to permitted activity standards for site coverage etc as detailed in submission points S343.003 - S343.017].	I think the premise of Plan Change 29 to 'go upward' is flawed - I'm sure, instead, we can 'go inward'. My proposal to alleviate potential population growth and housing needs for Nelson, - as an alternative to most of the proposed new rules included in Plan Change 29, - is to maximize and promote the use of Secondary Minor Dwellings on existing residential properties. While commonly called 'Granny Flats', such small dwellings can provide affordable housing solutions for single persons, young couples and small families, as well as aging grandparents. I myself live in a 15m2 studio apartment with my son's family in the house above. Now while so called 'in-fill' development is part of the proposals for Plan Change 29, and while such development has been an ongoing strategy for developers and builders in New Zealand now for decades, there are still many difficulties under existing legislation in most centres, to allow such development to proceed without undue cost or 'red tape'. Auckland City Councils Unitary Plan, since around 2016, has cleverly adopted easier paths for allowing secondary minor dwellings on existing sites, in order to ease pressure on housing needs and on their choked transport infrastructure. A few years ago the Auckland City Council, in conjunction with Prefab NZ, launched a design competition for teams to come up with ideas for prefabricated small dwellings between 30m2 and 65m2... A conservative estimate of half the residential properties in Nelson that are currently in the 40% site coverage zone, - say around 10,000 households; with an additional secondary minor dwelling, could provide an average of 3 more beds per site. That then totals about 30,000 new beds for the city of Nelson within a few years. (Nelson stats from 2013 show 18,500 households.) In 2020, Nelson's population was 52,900, so this proposal could effectively provide for a 50% rise in population within a few years - without any upward development. L...and low to middle income	Accept	*Section 6*

FS38.004	Small Time Developments		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support in part are: Maximize and promote the use of Secondary Minor Dwellings on existing residential properties. without a Resource Consent [with the associated changes to permitted activity standards for site coverage etc as detailed in submission points S343.003 - S343.017]. Agree with the intent of this submission to encourage infill in a less intrusive manner, but perhaps the change to 3 dwellings will address this. Not every site will be developed intensively so the granny flat option will be available under this new rule.	Accept	*Section 6*
S343.003	Mark Fielding	Residential Zones	Amend	Increase site coverage to 50% on sites larger than 400m2 in Standard Residential Zones that currently have a 40% coverage rule.	Change to 50% site coverage (as per Plan Change 29). This will allow easing for the implementation of additional minor dwellings that I am proposing. This would be limited to residential zones that are currently restricted to 40% site coverage. The Wood and other higher density areas would remain at 30% which can be raised to 33% with a discretionary Resource Consent. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S343.004	Mark Fielding	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Retain existing daylight controls.	No change to existing Daylight controls; which continue to effectively protect neighbours from new developments blocking daylight admission. Note that Plan Change 29 eliminates the road boundary daylight control, which protects public spaces from shading, and it also eliminates the Daylight Around control, which provides for small steep sites where daylight over controls are too restrictive. I say that no change to daylight Controls is warranted, leave it be.	Reject	*Section 6*

S343.005	Mark Fielding	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Retain existing yard setbacks from boundaries.	No change to yard Set-backs from boundaries. At present anyone can build right up to the boundary in any Nelson residential properties, provided that daylight controls are maintained and that a fire rated wall is constructed within 1m from a property boundary. Plan Change 29 provides for a 1m setback yard to all properties, but there is no need for this, the existing set back rules work fine to protect neighbours.	Reject	*Section 6*
S343.009	Mark Fielding	Residential Zones	Amend	Require affected neighbours sign off where Resource Consent is required for any breach of rules.	Suggestion that a Resource Consent is not required unless bulk and location requirements were breached. Similar to Plan Change 29 edicts. However if a Resource Consent was required for any breach of rules, then affected neighbours would need to sign off on such; unfortunately this has been relaxed significantly in recent years.	Reject	*Section 6*
S343.012	Mark Fielding	Residential Zones	Amend	Limit building sized [for new secondary minor dwellings inferred] to between a 30m2 Studio unit up to a 60m2, 2Bedroom unit, provided a 50% site coverage rule was adhered to and all other bulk and location rules are adhered to.	Building size to be limited to between a 30m2 Studio unit up to a 60m2, 2Bedroom unit. All provided a 50% site coverage rule was adhered to and all other bulk and location rules adhered to.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S343.014	Mark Fielding	Residential Zones	Amend	Limit construction of new buildings to those on piled foundations to allow for future removal or replacement of the building.	Construction would be limited to piled foundations for future potential removal or replacement of the building. This allows for subsequent owners wanting more yard space or wanting a larger unit. It also allows for a seller to remove the building for use on their next property or to sell it at a profit. Small to medium construction companies could spring up in town to cater for this growing trend, just as they have done for the Tiny House Movement - and those could also be allowed too if connected to services on site and if compliant with bulk and location rules. Thus local building companies will add to the local economy instead of large corporates building multi-storey steel and concrete boxes taking profits elsewhere.	Reject	*Section 6*

S344.007	Marion Satherley	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Reduced levels of physical well-being as sunshine is a source of Vitamin D which builds immunity. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S344.008	Marion Satherley	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S344.007.	Reject	*Section 6*
S344.009	Marion Satherley	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S344.012	Marion Satherley	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S344.014	Marion Satherley	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S344.028	Marion Satherley	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S344.027.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*

S345.007	Leonie Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S345.008	Leonie Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S345.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S345.009	Leonie Allen	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S345.012	Leonie Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S345.014	Leonie Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S345.028	Leonie Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S345.027.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*

S346.007	Daniel Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S346.008	Daniel Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S346.007.	Reject	*Section 6*
S346.009	Daniel Allen	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S346.012	Daniel Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S346.014	Daniel Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S346.028	Daniel Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S346.027.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*

S348.007	Rodney Lewis	Residential Zones	Oppose	Not stated.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S348.009	Rodney Lewis	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S348.012	Rodney Lewis	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S348.014	Rodney Lewis	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S348.028	Rodney Lewis	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S348.027.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*

S350.007	Andrew Lush	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S350.008	Andrew Lush	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S350.007.	Reject	*Section 6*
S350.009	Andrew Lush	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S350.012	Andrew Lush	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S350.014	Andrew Lush	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S350.028	Andrew Lush	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S350.027.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S352.008	Derek & Karen Austin	Residential Zones	Amend	[Amend the] recession angles be 50-55 degrees. [Amend] the height recession angles start at [to] 3 metres	We oppose the proposed recession angles.	Reject	*Section 6*

S353.007	Rodney Lewis	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	*Section 6*
S353.008	Rodney Lewis	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point 006.	Accept	*Section 6*
S353.009	Rodney Lewis	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S353.012	Rodney Lewis	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. Eg Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S353.014	Rodney Lewis	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S353.028	Rodney Lewis	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point 26	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*

S354.007	Sally Albrecht	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S354.008	Sally Albrecht	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S354.007.	Reject	*Section 6*
S354.009	Sally Albrecht	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S354.012	Sally Albrecht	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S354.014	Sally Albrecht	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S354.028	Sally Albrecht	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S354.027.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*

S355.001	Bernard Penketh	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S355.002	Bernard Penketh	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S355.003	Bernard Penketh	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S355.014	Bernard Penketh	Residential Zones	Oppose	Allow for tiny homes on properties for granny type accommodation, providing they don't infringe on a neighbour's daylight, etc	Not stated.	Accept	*Section 6*
S361.007	Michael Scott	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend REr.18O, REr.18P and REr.18Q so they are not in conflict with each other (also do the same for the High density residential zone commercial activity rules). Also provide for other small-scale commercial activities such as barbers, hairdressers, tailors and similar service-oriented or place-based activities.	These zones are not suitable for comparative retail, but with the density increasing, they would be complemented very well with some supportive retail that enables residents to fulfil everyday needs (buying milk, catching up with a friend for coffee are already provided for; other compatible commercial activities in the zone would include getting a haircut or having a shirt repaired, getting nails done, doing the laundry) without leaving the neighbourhood. If these activities are not included in the zone, then suburban commercial zones should be expanded to accommodate them.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S368.007	Philip McKinlay	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	a. Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. It is not called the 'Sunshine Capital of NZ' for no reason. It is well documented that people relocate to Nelson because of the Sun and accept reduced wages called 'Sunshine Wages' for that privilege. b. Tasman District Council even 'Encourage the Sun into your home'. See https://www.tasman.govt.nz/my-property/building-and-alteration/heating- and-insulation/energy-efficiency-and-heating-your-home/. c. Reference is made again to the previously mentioned " Nelson-Tasman Housing We'd Choose - Housing Demand Preferences", (in point 2 above). In Figure 4.9: "Ranked Preferences of Housing - Nelson Urban", where 100% of Residents ranked "Sunny" as their most important preference. d. All existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules (Nelson Resource Management Plan - appendix 15, daylight admission - residential) will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: - i. Increased levels of mental health illness, anxiety and stress. ii. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. iii. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. iv. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print, are all exacerbated due to a large portion of Nelson housing being old, with un-insulated walls and single glazing with open fires being legislated out of use many years ago. v. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress, because the houses would be less desirable to live in. vi. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not be able to afford to heat their homes. vii. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section, due to the fact that "affordable" additional units could be built by a wealthier developer, who could afford to build a multi-storey development around established properties at any time in the future. [Refer to	Reject	*Section 6*

S368.008	Philip McKinlay	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain 112.1.1A and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of privacy as well as encourage residential units to be	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S368.012	Philip McKinlay	Residential Zones	Amend	Recommend that Council take a serious look at the option of Granny Flats for Nelson properties.	One of the issues of concern is the lack of affordable housing in NZ generally and in Nelson in particular. PC29 does not appear to do anything to address the affordability concerns and it seems that inner city apartments are in general around the $1million plus range, which is not affordable to many residents. The multi storey buildings are likely only to benefit developers and building companies. As mentioned above I support the replacement of the High Density Residential Zone with the General Residential Zone, which allows for the building of Granny Flats and Tiny Homes. A report by town planning research analysts has just been released into using Granny Flats as a viable alternative in solving their housing crisis concluding that there was an "untapped potential to boost housing supply". The report says that granny flats have the ability to quickly and affordably address some of their current housing crisis. The report also says that for homeowners, the addition of a second self-contained unit provides an opportunity to provide rental housing or additional accommodation for family members while at the same time increasing the value of their property and potentially attaining additional rental income. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Accept	*Section 6*

FS38.047	Small Time Developments		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support are: Recommend that Council take a serious look at the option of Granny Flats for Nelson properties. Agree with the intent of this submission to encourage infill in a less intrusive manner, but perhaps the change to 3 dwellings will address this. Not every site will be developed intensively so the granny flat option will be available under this new rule.	Accept	*Section 6*
S368.018	Philip McKinlay	Residential Zones	Support in part	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy RE2.3; [and the associated explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i.	I strongly support the inclusion [retention] of "Nelson Resource Management Plan RE2.3 Daylight and Sunlight" policy statement "Buildings and Structures should be designed and sited so that adjoining sites are not unduly shaded and there is reasonable access to daylight"	Reject	*Section 6*
S368.019	Philip McKinlay	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Retain the operative wording of policy] RE2.5 "The size and scale of buildings, structures, should be compatible with the character and amenity of the residential area"	Refer to the reasons in submission points S368.005 & S368.006.	Reject	*Section 6*
S368.023	Philip McKinlay	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S368.028	Philip McKinlay	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council have more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S368.014.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S369.001	Stephen Bayley	Residential Zones	Oppose	Retain existing residential [standards] for building height, sunlight angles, footprint, distance from boundaries, and providing	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S371.002	Janet Moloney	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the removal of provisions that allow for non-notification.	Refer to the reasons in S371.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S378.003	Seymour Avenue Residents - c/o	Mapping	Oppose	[Rezone] the properties adjoining the Seymour Avenue Heritage Precinct, and in the wider area, properties that provide contextual significance to the Seymour Avenue Heritage Precinct, as a General Residential Zone.	Adjoining and wider properties that provide contextual significance to the Seymour Avenue Heritage Precinct should be recognised and appropriately be accorded protection.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS65.142	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support are: [Rezone] the properties adjoining the Seymour Avenue Heritage Precinct, and in the wider area, properties that provide contextual significance to the Seymour Avenue Heritage Precinct, as a General Residential Zone. Reasons include (please also refer to our original submission #831 as in many cases multiple reasons have been noted): PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new study on effects of proposals on heritage and character of City is required. The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice. It has been undertaken by one person rather than a multidisciplinary team.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS78.152	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: [Rezone] the properties adjoining the Seymour Avenue Heritage Precinct, and in the wider area, properties that provide contextual significance to the Seymour Avenue Heritage Precinct, as a General Residential Zone. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A comprehensive independent study of the effects of this proposal on the character and heritage buildings of Nelson that informs changes to proposed rules and policies (on and off-site height, boundary set back, daylight angles) is required. The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice.	Reject	*Section 6*
S379.004	Carole-Ann Lewis	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Increase the side and rear yard set backs for new buildings].	No building should be only 1m from the boundary.	Reject	*Section 6*

S380.004	Sharon Bryce	Residential Zones	Oppose	Apply height restrictions along with less dwellings per site so people are not denied sunlight.	Whichever residential zone we are talking about sunlight is the big one. Its absurd to build anything that blocks out peoples direct sunlight especially given the cold winters we have here and how much of a push there is for warm healthy homes. Blocking the sun is not compatible with the push for warmer healthier homes. I favour height restrictions along with less dwellings per site so people are not denied direct sunlight.	Reject	*Section 6*
S380.006	Sharon Bryce	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Consider] staggered row housing with a focus on good design and not so many dwellings per site, limited in height to 2 stories.	This style of housing gives each house a small garden for kids to play, to grow your own veggies, relax outdoors, meet neighbours and socialise. It makes for a community and integrates the housing into the neighbourhood. Less worries for local residents about cutting off the sun and loosing privacy. This type of housing negates the need for residents to soley rely on nearby public parks or greenspace.	Reject	*Section 6*
S381.003	Peter Sheppard	Residential Zones	Not Stated	Encourage minor dwelllings to be constructed on existing sites and 2nd full dwellings of 1 - 2 storeys, with rules relaxed in terms of site coverage etc to enable this type of extra housing.	This could also bring in more funds in terms of rates payments to afford the corresponding increase in spending necessary for sewage and stormwater services, roading etc.	Accept	*Section 6*
S383.001	Karin Harrison	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S383.002	Karin Harrison	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S383.003	Karin Harrison	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S384.007	Arif Matthee	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S384.008	Arif Matthee	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S384.007.	Reject	*Section 6*
S384.009	Arif Matthee	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S384.012	Arif Matthee	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S384.014	Arif Matthee	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S384.028	Arif Matthee	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S384.027.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*

S386.001	Eric Peter	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S386.002	Eric Peter	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S386.003	Eric Peter	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S387.001	David Bennett	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. The allowance of three storeys with minimal set back from boundaries is excessive.	Reject	Section 6
S387.002	David Bennett	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. The allowance of three storeys with minimal set back from boundaries is excessive.	Reject	Section 6
S387.003	David Bennett	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S387.013	David Bennett	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules to allow a higher site coverage].	A higher density build could be established by the [relaxing] of the existing site coverage rules.	Reject	*Section 6*
S387.014	David Bennett	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Increase] the allowed number of units on sites.	A higher density build could be established by allowing for increased numbers of units on sites (sections).	Reject	*Section 6*

S387.015	David Bennett	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] the current daylight angle and set back requirements [in the NRMP].	Also the aspect of council revising the daylight angles away from the current model without wide public notification and commentary shows it is not acting in the best interest of the public.	Reject	*Section 6*
S387.016	David Bennett	Residential Zones	Oppose	Limit the building heights to two storeys.	No three level development in the residential zones unless it is on large format blocks of land and designed in accordance with the current daylight angles and is open to consultation where the affected parties have the ability to have input on the design before consent is granted.	Reject	*Section 6*
S388.007	Gary Calderbank	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight entering and being harnessed in the home is essential for healthy and sustainable design. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S388.008	Gary Calderbank	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point s388.007.	Reject	*Section 6*
S388.009	Gary Calderbank	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*

S388.012	Gary Calderbank	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S388.014	Gary Calderbank	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S388.028	Gary Calderbank	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Consider how] many of the recommendations [in this submission] could provide options for social housing without negatively impacting on existing residents. [Refer to decision requests in submission point S388.019 and subsequent	Refer to reasons in submission point S388.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S388.033	Gary Calderbank	Residential Zones	Oppose	incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of placing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage	Refer to reasons in submission point S388.019.	Reject	*Section 6*
S389.003	Elizabeth Dooley	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Require] new buildings to be located on the south side of their site.	To enable maximum sunlight (as opposed to daylight) to be enjoyed by people who's properties join these buildings on this side. To show consideration to neighbours in this situation. We need an attractive city that attracts tourism and residents, and if it is badly planned, we will fade away as an attractive venue.	Reject	*Section 6*
S389.004	Elizabeth Dooley	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Require] apartment buildings to have a green area and a play area. [Consider allowing] this space to be shared by different apartment blocks accessing this area.	We need an attractive city that attracts tourism and residents, and if it is badly planned, we will fade away as an attractive venue.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S390.003	Thomas Currie	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the removal of provisions that allow for non-notification.	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S391.002	Thomas Croker	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Reduce the housing density of 3 units per site in the General Residential zone to 2 units.	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S392.001	Johanna Peter	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S392.002	Johanna Peter	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S392.003	Johanna Peter	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S393.001	Paul Fox	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S393.002	Paul Fox	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S393.003	Paul Fox	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S394.001	Offsite NZ	Residential Zones	Amend	Clarify the definition of a relocated dwelling to specifically limit it to a re-used building and explicitly exclude new offsite manufactured dwellings from its Relocated Dwelling definition and examples.	We have been made aware that the Nelson City Council (NCC) current Relocated Dwelling rules do not differentiate between delivery of new builds and relocated established dwellings. Therefore there is some confusion regarding the need for resource consent as an offsite manufactured new build is assessed in a similar way to an "old" repurposed dwelling that requires significant renovations to ensure it is habitable and blends into the surroundings. Offsite manufactured buildings should be assessed in the same manner as a new build built onsite in a traditional way. The offsite sector is striving to improve the way New Zealand builds and helps to improve productivity & quality and reduce waste. Wider policy settings are supporting the adoption of offsite solutions including the Building Amendment Act 2021, Building for Climate Change and the Commerce Commissions recommendation for an all-of-government strategy to support the offsite manufacturing sector. Councils play an important role in encouraging the use of offsite manufactured solutions to help improve the build environment so it is recommended that the Council ensure that the pathways for appoving such solutions are clear and concise.	Reject	*Section 6*
S395.001	Andrew Sullivan	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S395.002	Andrew Sullivan	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S395.003	Andrew Sullivan	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S397.007	Ali Lawley	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S397.008	Ali Lawley	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S397.007.	Reject	*Section 6*
S397.009	Ali Lawley	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S397.012	Ali Lawley	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. Eg Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S397.014	Ali Lawley	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*

S397.028	Ali Lawley	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Consider how] many of the recommendations [in this submission] could provide options for social housing without negatively impacting on existing residents. [Refer to decision requests in submission point S397.019 and subsequent	Refer to reasons in submission point S397.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S398.007	Heritage New Zealand	Residential Zones	Support	Retain provision [REd - Description - REd.3].	HNZPT supports the description [REd - Description - REd.3], which includes reference to the historic settlement patterns and heritage areas of Nelson.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS78.482	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission I support are: Whole submission. National body response. See my submission for full reasons. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new comprehensive independent study of the effects of this proposal on the character and heritage buildings of Nelson that informs changes to proposed rules and policies (on and off-site height, boundary set back, daylight angles). The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice. It has been undertaken by one person rather than a multidisciplinary team.	Accept	*Section 6*
S398.008	Heritage New Zealand	Residential Zones	Support	Retain provision [Objective RE1.1 Densities].	HNZPT supports this objective to provide for a range of densities in Nelson.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS78.483	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission I support are: Whole submission. National body response. See my submission for full reasons. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new comprehensive independent study of the effects of this proposal on the character and heritage buildings of Nelson that informs changes to proposed rules and policies (on and off-site height, boundary set back, daylight angles). The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice. It has been undertaken by one person rather than a multidisciplinary team.	Accept	*Section 6*
S398.009	Heritage New Zealand	Residential Zones	Support	Retain provision [Policy RE1.2 - flexibility indevelopment].	HNZPT supports this policy to allow for flexibility in density and building form.	Accept	*Section 6*

FS78.484	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission I support are: Whole submission. National body response. See my submission for full reasons. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new comprehensive independent study of the effects of this proposal on the character and heritage buildings of Nelson that informs changes to proposed rules and policies (on and off-site height, boundary set back, daylight angles). The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice. It has been undertaken by one person rather than a multidisciplinary team.	Accept	*Section 6*
S399.003	Wendy Drummond	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Reassess side and rear yard setbacks].	Distances from boundaries should be re-assessed to ensure buildings don't impinge aesthetically or practically, e.g. block sunlight or solar panels.	Reject	*Section 6*
S402.001	Russell King	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S402.002	Russell King	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S402.003	Russell King	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S403.007	Ashley Frechette	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S403.008	Ashley Frechette	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S403.007.	Reject	*Section 6*
S403.009	Ashley Frechette	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S403.012	Ashley Frechette	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S403.014	Ashley Frechette	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S403.028	Ashley Frechette	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S403.027.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*

S405.007	Patricia Carter	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. I am vitally concerned as my home is in Wellington Street and as I have written previously, your plans will give me no privacy and no sunshine. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S405.008	Patricia Carter	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S405.007.	Reject	*Section 6*
S405.009	Patricia Carter	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property. I am vitally concerned as my home is in Wellington Street and as I have written previously, your plans will give me no privacy and no sunshine.	Reject	*Section 6*
S405.012	Patricia Carter	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S405.014	Patricia Carter	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S405.028	Patricia Carter	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S405.027.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*

S406.007	Debbie Hampson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S406.008	Debbie Hampson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S406.007.	Reject	*Section 6*
S406.009	Debbie Hampson	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S406.012	Debbie Hampson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S406.014	Debbie Hampson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S406.028	Debbie Hampson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S406.027.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*

S407.001	Earle Family Home Trust	Residential Zones	Oppose	In conjunction with amendments to the relevant daylight admission rules, change policy RE2.3 to provide appropriate recognition of the impacts anticipated from intensification.	PC29 will fundamentally change the current daylight admission rules in the NRMP and yet PC29 does not proposed any change to policy RE2.3. It is considered that RE2.3 must also be amended as the new daylight admission rule will lead to significant impacts on privacy and outlook.	Reject	*Section 6*
S407.002	Earle Family Home Trust	Residential Zones	Oppose	In conjunction with amendments to the relevant bulk and location rules, change policy RE2.4 to provide appropriate recognition of the impacts anticipated from intensification.	PC29 will fundamentally change the current bulk and location rules in the NRMP and yet PC29 does not proposed any significant change to policy RE2.4. It is considered that RE2.4 must also be amended as the bulk and location rules will lead to undue shading impacts in their current form.	Reject	*Section 6*
S407.003	Earle Family Home Trust	Residential Zones	Oppose	In conjunction with amendments to the relevant bulk and location rules, change policy RE2.5 to provide appropriate recognition of the impacts anticipated from intensification.	PC29 will fundamentally change the current bulk and location rules in the NRMP and yet PC29 does not proposed any significant change to policy RE2.5. It is considered that RE2.5 must also be amended as the bulk and location rules will lead to significant impacts on the building character and amenity of residential areas.	Reject	*Section 6*
S409.007	Mary McKinlay	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S409.008	Mary McKinlay	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3 and RE2.5 of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S409.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S409.009	Mary McKinlay	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S409.011	Mary McKinlay	Mapping	Oppose	Apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district. Specifically, either leave the existing zone (as currently applies to 25 Bronte Street) or replace it with the General Residential Zone that allows for up to three, two-storey buildings on a site, providing existing sunlight, daylight, and outlook provisions are retained.	Under PC29 the majority of the residential are to the north of [our] property and to the south of Christ Church Cathedral is zoned high density, which allows for building of up to 6 storeys one metre from the boundary with no protection of existing daylight, sunlight or outlook. The proposed plan change means that [sunlight and outlook] and [the ability to grow our own fruit and vegetables] will no longer be assured. Refer also to reasons in submission points S409.007,S409.009, and S409.010.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS28.024	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Apply new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson District. The Tahunanui (flat) and Monaco residential areas are largely outside the PC29 boundaries and comprise either standard residential or low-density zoning. Applying a general residential zoning across all existing residential zones would provide for up to 3 residential units per site as a permitted activity. However, there are a number of areas that are not appropriate for further residential intensification, in particular those areas subject to the Nelson Airport Overlays.	Accept	*Section 6*
S409.014	Mary McKinlay	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S409.028	Mary McKinlay	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S409.027.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*

S409.034	Mary McKinlay	Residential Zones	Support	Consider the [suitability] of granny flats to address the housing crisis in Nelson.	A report by Archistar, Blackfort, and CoreLogic in Australia found Granny Flats as a potentially viable alternative to solve their housing crisis. The report says, the addition of a second self-contained until provides an opportunity to provide rental housing or accommodation for family members while increasing the value of their property and potentially attaining rental income. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Accept	*Section 6*
FS38.005	Small Time Developments		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support in part are: Consider the [suitability] of granny flats to address the housing crisis in Nelson. Agree with the intent of this submission to encourage infill in a less intrusive manner, but perhaps the change to 3 dwellings will address this. Not every site will be developed intensively so the granny flat option will be available under this new rule.	Accept	*Section 6*
S413.003	Scott Figenshow	Residential Zones	Amend	Confirm the approval pathway for a property owner to request reclassification of a sleepout or existing secondary structure, to a compliant residential unit.	In our example, a Building Consent application to add a kitchen, and providing evidence of our compliance with the PC29 provisions should result in granting of the consent. Because we appear to be within the SIA3 Overlay, we fear that we would be asked to obtain fresh engineering reports when applying for a building consent for adding a kitchen to the existing sleep out. This would reclassify it as a residential unit, and at present PC29 does not appear to distinguish between a new residential unit built with that application and one built under a previous consent but now reclassified. The geotech reports and engineering performed during the construction of our sleepout should provide adquate evidence to council that the building satisfies any engineering it would require now that the area is included in the Slope Instability Area 3 Overlay.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

FS28.129	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Confirm the approval pathway for a property owner to request reclassification of a sleepout or existing secondary structure to a compliant residential unit. A tiny home or granny flat comprises an individual residential unit and would provide for potentially inappropriate residential intensification if allowed as a permitted activity on properties with an existing residential unit. There are a number of areas that are not appropriate for further residential intensification in particular those areas subject to the Nelson Airport Overlays.	Reject in part (for those areas not affected by the Airport Overlay)	*Section 6*
S417.007	David Smith	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S417.008	David Smith	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S417.007.	Reject	*Section 6*
S417.009	David Smith	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*

S417.012	David Smith	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S417.014	David Smith	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S417.028	David Smith	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point s417.027.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S419.001	John Karolyi	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Retain] recession planes as they are with some greenfield development exceptions.The exception to this would be in a greenfield development which does not impact upon existing occupied or brownfield spaces, two sets of rules, one for "new land" one for "existing occupied land", where the edge of a greenfield borders existing, I would expect existing recession planes to be dominant. [Refer to marked up version of appendix 15 daylight admission (residential) provided in the original submission].	The recession planes are too invasive, I would expect them to stay the same. (a) I note that the rma stated sunlight was important to wellbeing, there is nothing that addresses that here. (b) I note that the design elements for the oversized building state they should sit well for the sun, therefore acknowledging how important the sun is on a building and the buildings occupants, but the size allowance totally corrupts existing residents and land-owners access to sun, privacy and the like. The evaluation for the oversize buildings stated there would be detrimental effects to anyone subjected to being in the shadow of such a building both monetary wise, (valuation), as well as wellbeing. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S419.007	John Karolyi	Residential Zones	Support in part	[Support] infill.	Yes to infill, I note that some buildings that were knocked down, and tasteful townhouse style developments have happened (Nayland road semi detached, Totara St detached) all single level and not intrusive, all with current framework.	Accept	*Section 6*

S419.009	John Karolyi	Residential Zones	Amend	[Support] taller buildings on greenfield developments, but with [the] proviso that where the greenfield borders existing properties more strenuous conditions apply. (Current Daylight angles) ie daylight angle from any building on the greenfield development to be 2.5m at boundary and existing angles as per daylight admission resendential appendix 15 which	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S419.011	John Karolyi	Residential Zones	Amend	[Support] Medium Density up Vanguard St, but with existing daylight angle provisos where boundaries meet with existing properties. Once a property has accessed the "new" zoning heights then that property is subject to the new zoning on all its boundaries, the "old restrictions no longer apply to that property.	This means the council would be running two sets of daylight angles one for existing properties, and one for properties that have accessed the "new" daylight angle provision. Over a period of time the change would happen by itself with little consequence to existing residents.	Reject	*Section 6*
S420.001	Simon Hall	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Permit] comprehensive housing development in existing lower and standard density zones so long as the risks from natural hazards are appropriately managed.	The Plan seeks to minimize the number of units in the existing lower, standard and higher density areas due to natural hazard risks. Rather, it is considered that the direction should be to ensure that natural hazards are appropriately managed. Not providing this opportunity is considered to result in an inefficient use of a valuable land resource.	Reject	*Section 6*
S420.002	Simon Hall	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Amend] daylight recession planes and height planes in [the] existing lower, standard and higher density zones [to ensure] that they are measured from floor levels required to mitigate	Refer to reasons in submission point S420.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S421.002	Craig Duffy	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Oppose] larger buildings in the suburbs.	Refer to reasons in submission point S421.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S423.002	Susan Richards	Residential Zones	Support in part	[Retain existing daylight angles and privacy protection provisions].	Council must protect neighbours' current access to sunlight and privacy and new developments must not degrade the amenity or ecology of the neighbourhood. Protect existing resident investment in their homes, solar and water capture, ability to grow their own food and access to infrastructure services.	Reject	*Section 6*
S425.004	Tony Stephens	Residential Zones	Support in part	Encourage ground level shops through higher density housing.	So residents can shop locally as much as possible, and that where practicable, not even public transport is needed for basic necessities, such as groceries and pharmacies.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S426.004	L Knight	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Create] design requirements for large developments.	Site-specific consideration is always appropriate for large developments, and design guidance would assist. It is ironic that the proposal is to remove design rules and guidance at the same time as providing for significant intensification - that is exactly when they are needed.	Accept	*Section 6*
S428.003	Stephen Mullins	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Request] that the provision of sunlight on neighbouring properties be better considered.	The report on housing preferences - Housing We'd Choose commissioned by NCC and TDC in June, 2021 for the Future Development Strategy (FDS) ranked "Sunny" as the most important factor in housing criteria in the Nelson Urban area. I cannot see how the heights in new builds in medium and high density zones and the changes to the recessional angles with meet this stated preference. I would like the existing conditions for daylight to remain unchanged.	Reject	*Section 6*
S428.006	Stephen Mullins	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Request] Council to give preference to a minimum of two storey dwellings to be built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	I'm concerned about the new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is an under utilization of land that can accommodate increased demand..	Reject	*Section 6*
S429.002	Tahunanui Business Citizen Association	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Require every future subdivision in Nelson to be a minimum of 2 storeys, and with integrated social housing on a ratio of 1:5 on every	Refer to reasons in submission point S429.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS56.043	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought by the submitter. A minimum two storeys may not be appropriate on every site, and some locations may not be appropriate for social housing. The relief sought could also create financial issues for market delivery, hindering intensification and housing delivery. Kāinga Ora considers that a method that remedies or mitigates adverse effects generated by a new development on the affordability of housing through requiring a contribution towards the provision of affordable or social housing would be more appropriate.	Accept	*Section 6*

S429.007	Tahunanui Business Citizen Association	Residential Zones	Oppose	Protect all existing properties in terms of their access to light.	To warm their homes, utilise their access to sunlight for solar, heating homes and maintaining their gardens and outdoor activities.	Reject	*Section 6*
S431.005	Bruce Mutton	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Amend the daylight rules in residential zones to be dependant on orientation of property boundaries rather than the boundaries relationship to the street.	So as to be able to manage sunlight and daylight access to neighbouring properties in a equitably, daylight rules should be dependant on the orientation of the property boundary (N, S, E, W) as is currently the case. The proposed rules dependant on relationship of property boundaries to the street (front, side, rear) would seem to mean that properties on north-south aligned streets are shaded more than properties on east west aligned streets. Because on N-S aligned streets, buildings (apartment blocks) will have their long sides blocking the generally north sun of their neighbours to the south, for more of the day - I think.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S432.002	Tracy Rowberry	Residential Zones	Oppose	Do not amend the current sunshine angles.	It seems ridiculous to me that a current occupied residence can be denied any part of its sun by a new build. What would people do with their solar panels?? Bin them??? Or just not put them in the first place. Nelson people want the sun. That's what they come here for and why they don't leave.	Reject	*Section 6*
S432.005	Tracy Rowberry	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Retain the current requirements for notifying consents.	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S433.001	Rosemary Waterson	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Allow neighborhood to have input before any developer is given consent to develop.	It may impact on quality and enjoyment of life of community who already live there. It could devalue nearby properties by lack of privacy and sun. Also impact on traffic flow and safety on roads.	Reject	*Section 6*
S437.002	Richarrd Hite	Residential Zones	Not Stated	Maintain [existing] resource consent process.	I believe that removing the resource consent requirement will weaken council's abilitty to control the long term vision of the Council's plan by giving the developer the ability to circumnavigate this important step in the town planning process and Council's Vision of the future. [Refer to original submission for more detail.]	Reject	*Section 6*

S439.001	Adrienne Sargent	Residential Zones	Oppose	Limit the height of new buildings in residential areas to ensure shading does not occur and existing properties and their owners are not disadvantaged.	I think shading effects of any new building on existing buildings must be minimised. Sunlight is essential for all homes providing warm, dry homes for families, and other members of the community. All existing houses built under the current daylight admission rules will be subject to the loss of sunlight under PC29. I think it is unreasonable to build new homes that will block the sunlight of other existing homes. Loss of sunlight will lead to dampness in homes which is a threat to young children and elderly people, and may lead to severe respiratory diseases. Solar water heating and electricity generation panels will not perform as well if shaded by another building. The shading effects of any new building on an existing building must be minimised.	Reject	*Section 6*
S439.002	Adrienne Sargent	Residential Zones	Oppose	Limit the height of new buildings in residential areas to ensure shading does not occur and existing properties and their owners are not disadvantaged.	Refer to reasons in submission point S439.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S442.008	Vernon Mardon	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S442.009	Vernon Mardon	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S442.008.	Reject	*Section 6*
S442.010	Vernon Mardon	Residential Zones	Oppose	That the daylight angles proposed in Rules REr.18 and REr.19 (maximum building height) be removed, and replaced with the recession plane rules in the current Appendix 15.	Refer to reasons in submission point s442.008.	Reject	*Section 6*
S442.011	Vernon Mardon	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain] the following bracketed words:The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of privacy as well as encourage residential units to be	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S442.016	Vernon Mardon	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S442.025	Vernon Mardon	Residential Zones	Amend	[Amend the plan so that] any dwelling over 8m in the Standard Residential Zone (incorporating the proposed MDZ and HDZ) be a "non-complying" activity, requiring a resource consent, and requiring approval from affected persons and/or general notification.	That Nelson City Council, in order to allow for intensification by way of high-rise dwellings in the future, any dwelling over 8m in the Standard Residential Zone (incorporating the proposed MDZ and HDZ) be a "non-complying" activity, requiring a resource consent, and requiring approval from afected persons and/or general notification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S442.030	Vernon Mardon	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S442.029.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S443.008	Belinda Reburn	Residential Zones	Support in part	[Request] that as part of our Plan Change 29, the Nelson City Council provide 'Rules' around the quality of new housing stock, that promotes answers to housing that provide for	Refer to reasons in submission point S443.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS78.474	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission I support are: various. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences; amenity and value in the CBD and residential areas will be lost if it goes ahead.	Accept	*Section 6*

S444.003	Penny Molnar	Residential Zones	Support in part	[Provide] affordable housing wihin existing city areas.	There is urgent need for more affordable housing within existing city limits that includes a mix of private, community and public housing developments. Adhoc development will not produce satisfactory outcomes. NCC take control to ensure there is a good balance of housing in neighbourhoods. Not leave it to Developers including Kianga Ora.	Accept	*Section 6*
S444.004	Penny Molnar	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Clarify the blanket 3 and 6 storey building limit.	The proposed blanket building code needs to be clarified to allow for qualitative controls and standards to ensure good quality outcomes, reduction of divisiveness in neighbourhoods and positive impacts on the urban areas overall.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S449.002	Eva Currie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules to make it] easier to add another kitchen to an existing building to support intensification.	I support urban intensification but with appropriate controls that support the amenity, sunlight, and privacy for existing urban inhabitants.	Accept	*Section 6*
S449.003	Eva Currie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules to make it] easier to build a tiny home / granny flat.	I support urban intensification but with appropriate controls that support the amenity, sunlight, and privacy for existing urban inhabitants.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS28.131	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Amend the rules to make it easier to build a tiny home / granny flat. A tiny home or granny flat comprises an individual residential unit and would provide for potentially inappropriate residential intensification if allowed as a permitted activity on properties with an existing residential unit. There are a number of areas that are not appropriate for further residential intensification in particular those areas subject to the Nelson Airport Overlays and it is important that these areas are not further intensified with sensitive activities.	Reject as it relates to areas outside of the Airport Overlays	*Section 6*
S449.004	Eva Currie	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain existing sunlight angles.	Any addition in height should only be allowed if maintaining existing sunlight angles i.e. would mean building further away from the boundary.	Reject	*Section 6*

S450.004	Bernard Brewster	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a huge part of living in Nelson. PC29 has no regard for sunshine robbery. Its only concern is "daylight" which lacks the critical element of warming sunshine. It is well documented that people relocate to Nelson because of its sunshine, accepting subpar wages (called 'Sunshine wages') for that privilege. All existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29, with the following effects: Increased levels of mental illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould, mildew and respiratory illness. Shadowing of solar panels and passive solar heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution and carbon footprints. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents struggling with the cost-of-living crisis might not afford extra home-heating. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in additional infill units that may be overshadows and devalued by a multi-storey development going up next door at any time in the future. Sunlight being available to every household is a critical residential amenity, providing warmth and energy efficiency, and in winter it is also vital for outdoor activities, such as gardening and recreation. This imperative is unaffected by whether or not the neighbour is residential, nor whether they be on an adjoining site or across the street.	Reject	*Section 6*
S450.005	Bernard Brewster	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Provide protections for neighbours to have a reasonable degree of privacy].	Privacy is a critical part of the 'quiet enjoyment' of a property. Neighbours must have a reasonable degree of privacy, and this is inevitably lost when large apartment blocks go up, over the fence.	Accept	*Section 6*

S450.011	Bernard Brewster	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments].	I oppose 'Green Field' developments for only single storey dwellings, as the land should properly accommodate two storey dwellings.	Reject	*Section 6*
S450.013	Bernard Brewster	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] require notification and written approval from neighbours [for any increase of residential units].	I strongly oppose any increase of residential units as a restricted discretionary activity that does NOT require notification and written approval from neighbours. Neighbours having no come-back on developer plans is a beggar-thy-neighbour approach and total denial of property rights and our democracy. The requirement for neighbours' approvals would sensibly restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks from popping up without warning, to span multiple sections and take up numerous on-street carparks.	Reject	*Section 6*
S450.014	Bernard Brewster	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Enable] large, older properties [to] be readily divided into multi-dwellings.	Large, older properties could be better utilised if they could be readily divided into multi-dwellings.	Accept	*Section 6*
S451.001	Lewis Thompson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S451.002	Lewis Thompson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S451.003	Lewis Thompson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S452.005	Claire McKenzie	Residential Zones	Support	Support general residential zone building heights of up to 2 storeys as permitted [inferred]	I am happy to see general residential zones having up to 2 storeys.	Accept	*Section 6*

S453.007	Stephen Webster	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.062	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS77.028	Harry Pearson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: The whole submission in its entirety. The reasons for my support: I agree entirely with what the submitter has submitted in their original submission. Due to other commitments and the short time frame for further submission, I do not have the time to outline the reasons form my support for all the submission points that Stephen Webster has made, but I will be happy to do this with the Hearing Panel if given sufficient time at the Hearing to state my points then.	Reject	*Section 6*
S453.008	Stephen Webster	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S453.007.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS20.005	Tim Bayley		Support	Accept	Existing daylight angles need to be respected and protected so we can all live with "our share" of sunshine....	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.063	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS77.029	Harry Pearson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: The whole submission in its entirety. The reasons for my support: I agree entirely with what the submitter has submitted in their original submission. Due to other commitments and the short time frame for further submission, I do not have the time to outline the reasons form my support for all the submission points that Stephen Webster has made, but I will be happy to do this with the Hearing Panel if given sufficient time at the Hearing to state my points then.	Reject	*Section 6*
S453.009	Stephen Webster	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.064	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS77.030	Harry Pearson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: The whole submission in its entirety. The reasons for my support: I agree entirely with what the submitter has submitted in their original submission. Due to other commitments and the short time frame for further submission, I do not have the time to outline the reasons form my support for all the submission points that Stephen Webster has made, but I will be happy to do this with the Hearing Panel if given sufficient time at the Hearing to state my points then.	Reject	*Section 6*
S453.012	Stephen Webster	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.067	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS77.033	Harry Pearson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: The whole submission in its entirety. The reasons for my support: I agree entirely with what the submitter has submitted in their original submission. Due to other commitments and the short time frame for further submission, I do not have the time to outline the reasons form my support for all the submission points that Stephen Webster has made, but I will be happy to do this with the Hearing Panel if given sufficient time at the Hearing to state my points then.	Reject	*Section 6*
S453.014	Stephen Webster	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.069	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS77.035	Harry Pearson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: The whole submission in its entirety. The reasons for my support: I agree entirely with what the submitter has submitted in their original submission. Due to other commitments and the short time frame for further submission, I do not have the time to outline the reasons form my support for all the submission points that Stephen Webster has made, but I will be happy to do this with the Hearing Panel if given sufficient time at the Hearing to state my points then.	Reject	*Section 6*
S453.028	Stephen Webster	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S453.027.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
FS83.083	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS77.049	Harry Pearson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: The whole submission in its entirety. The reasons for my support: I agree entirely with what the submitter has submitted in their original submission. Due to other commitments and the short time frame for further submission, I do not have the time to outline the reasons form my support for all the submission points that Stephen Webster has made, but I will be happy to do this with the Hearing Panel if given sufficient time at the Hearing to state my points then.	Reject	*Section 6*

S455.007	Philippa Hoult	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. Reduction in the ability for people to grow their own food. Properties that receive less sunshine will be more expensive to maintain and more difficult to tenant. The Housing Preference Survey 2021 shows 'Sunny' is a very highly ranked property feature for Nelson/Tasman residents. Nelson could be a world showcase for sustainable homes, loss of sunshine hours will prevent this. The majority of Nelson residents bought homes in an area with existing legal protection of residential amenities (in particular height and sunlight), and we reasonably expected that to continue. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S455.008	Philippa Hoult	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S455.007.	Reject	*Section 6*
S455.009	Philippa Hoult	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*

S455.012	Philippa Hoult	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S455.014	Philippa Hoult	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S455.028	Philippa Hoult	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S455.027.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S455.036	Philippa Hoult	Residential Zones	Oppose	Assess the impacts of future garaging and carparking.	This is not included in site coverage, taking up green space, with potential dramatic effects on stormwater discharge from properties.	Accept	*Section 6*
S455.047	Philippa Hoult	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Throughout] the Plan Change [delete] the expression "the ability to achieve the planned built character of the zone" and similar	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S456.001	Stephen Boulton	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S456.002	Stephen Boulton	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S456.003	Stephen Boulton	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S457.007	Laraine Rothenberg	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S457.008	Laraine Rothenberg	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules so that] daylight and sunlight received on a residential site should be no different whether or not the neighbour is residential [and] whether the building is on an adjoining site or across a street.	The reception of daylight and sunlight to each household unit is a critical component of residential amenity that provides warmth and energy efficiency, and is vital for outdoor activities such as gardening and recreation. To ensure shading effects are minimised, and to ensure there is sufficient space around buildings to allow the admission of daylight to the site. The basic premise is that the daylight and sunlight received on a residential site should be no different whether or not the neighbour is residential. This philosophy applies whether the building is on an adjoining site or across a street.	Reject	*Section 6*

S457.009	Laraine Rothenberg	Residential Zones	Support	Windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules should ensure that residential units [and their neighbours] have a reasonable degree of privacy as well as encourage residential units to be orientated towards the street or public open space.	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property. With certain plots these massive building can be oriented towards the side of a neighbour creating a untenable situation for existing homeowners. In fact, the threat of orientation or a building may force owners to sell to developers. In addition, the Sunlight Recession Planes and Shading Effects must be continued. Privacy and outlook must be preserved for existing homes. Intensification must be considered.	Accept	*Section 6*
S457.014	Laraine Rothenberg	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 2 units requires notification.	I oppose the increase of residential units beyond two in one storey, as a restricted discretionary activity that does not require notification and written approval from neighbours. Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S457.034	Laraine Rothenberg	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules to require] a minimum square meter area for [sites to be] used for two or more storeys.	Whatever land is used for two or more storeys should have a minimum square meter area. It is not appropriate to have skinny tall buildings.	Reject	*Section 6*
S459.002	Solitaire Investments Limited	Residential Zones	Support	Support the proposed development standards.	Refer to reasons in submission point S459.001.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

FS78.243	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Support the proposed development standards. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new comprehensive independent study of the effects of this proposal on the character and heritage buildings of Nelson that informs changes to proposed rules and policies (on and off-site height, boundary set back, daylight angles). The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice. It has been undertaken by one person rather than a multidisciplinary team. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS65.251	Heritage Nelson		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission we oppose is: Support the proposed development standards. Reasons include (please also refer to our original submission #831 as in many cases multiple reasons have been noted): PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new study on effects of proposals on heritage and character of City is required. The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice. It has been undertaken by one person rather than a multidisciplinary team.	Reject	*Section 6*

S459.003	Solitaire Investments Limited	Mapping	Amend	Rezone Solitaire's landholdings which are currently zoned Open Space or Rural Zone.	Solitaire considers, that there is an opportunity to look more comprehensively at their overall land holdings to explore if there are opportunities to also rezone some of their Open Space and Rural zoned land to better achieve the objectives of the Plan Change. Solitaire appreciates that this may fall outside the scope of the Plan Change as notified but nevertheless would welcome the opportunity to discuss this aspect of their submission with Council further.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS78.436	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences.	Accept	*Section 6*
S460.004	Richard Brudvik-Lindner	Residential Zones	Amend	Use design-based approaches to maximise light as we add density.	Nelson residents are rightly concerned about potential loss of sunlight, but many don't understand that much of what they currently have will be protected most of the time. This issue should have been confronted head-on at the outset and design-based approaches to maximise light should be a paramount consideration as we add density. Not being as careful on this issue has hurt the NCC approach.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S460.024	Richard Brudvik-Lindner	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Improve landscape requirements for intensified spaces, including landscaping, landscaping setbacks, islands and pockets.	Landscape requirements for intensified spaces should be a part of any PC29. We in NZ vastly underleverage the role of landscaping, plants and trees in creating the kind of liveable outdoor urban spaces, setbacks and buffers that must accompany PC29. This is all the more concerning given research about andscaping's role in creating a cooler environment in urban spaces for a world facing global warming. And NZ is lagging best practices seen around the world given the minimal requirements it sets for landscaping, landscape setbacks, islands and pockets. PC29 should rectify this. Of course, the easiest way to do this is through creation of an UDA, architectural standards, architectural review, etc. Further, it is not just the landscaping per se, but the setting aside of land as public green spaces that will allow people to live comfortably, happily and healthily in a more intensified urban environment. Places like Melbourne have a "Grey to Green" strategy (paved surfaces converted to green spaces - roads to grass). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S464.005	Rosemary Horn	Residential Zones	Amend	[Require] intensification to increase affordability by providing a range of facilities from studio, 1 and 2 bedroom options, rather than developers focusing on 3-4 bedrooms only.	This would benefit Nelson to encourage young professionals from bigger centres who are accustomed to having an apartment to themselves and are discouraged from moving to Nelson as the only option is to flat share. Young people starting out their careers would benefit from a greater choice of accommodation options in close proximity to the city centre. A greater range of 1-2 bedroom apartments would also benefit older single people who no longer want to maintain a garden and can easily get into the city with active or public transport.	Reject	*Section 6*

S464.006	Rosemary Horn	Residential Zones	Amend	[Require] landscaping around multi-storey intensification.	Consideration to the street space/side walk space is needed as intensification reduces green spaces which in turn means the environment will heat up. Landscaping around multi-storey intensification needs to be included in the design by the developers and in conjunction with the council to ensure there are plantings and trees. Refer to article link provided in the original submission.	Accept	*Section 6*
S466.003	Alan Stewart	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Undertake] intensificationof residential areas in the form of granny flats or small temporary dwellingsof a single storey height in existing	Not stated.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS28.133	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: [Undertake] intensification of residential areas in the form of granny flats or small temporary dwellings of a single storey height in existing backyards. A tiny home or granny flat comprises an individual residential unit and would provide for potentially inappropriate residential intensification if allowed as a permitted activity on properties with an existing residential unit. There are a number of areas that are not appropriate for further residential intensification in particular those areas subject to the Nelson Airport Overlays and it is important that these areas are not further intensified with sensitive activities.	Reject for areas not affected by Airport Overlays	*Section 6*
FS38.006	Small Time Developments		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support in part are: Undertake] intensification of residential areas in the form of granny flats or small temporary dwellings of a single storey height in existing backyards. Agree with the intent of this submission to encourage infill in a less intrusive manner, but perhaps the change to 3 dwellings will address this. Not every site will be developed intensively so the granny flat option will be available under this new rule.	Accept	*Section 6*

S467.001	Tasha Workman	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S467.002	Tasha Workman	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S467.003	Tasha Workman	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S469.007	Jontaine White	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S469.008	Jontaine White	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S469.007.	Reject	*Section 6*
S469.009	Jontaine White	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*

S469.012	Jontaine White	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S469.014	Jontaine White	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S469.028	Jontaine White	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S469.027.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S470.007	Amanda White	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S470.008	Amanda White	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S470.007.	Reject	*Section 6*
S470.009	Amanda White	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*

S470.012	Amanda White	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S470.014	Amanda White	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S470.028	Amanda White	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S470.027.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S471.002	Sue Fischer	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain operative daylight admission provisions].	Sunshine's need to stay as sunshine hours. These should not be changed.	Reject	*Section 6*
S472.007	Carol Webster	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S472.008	Carol Webster	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S472.007.	Reject	*Section 6*
S472.009	Carol Webster	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*

S472.012	Carol Webster	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S472.014	Carol Webster	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S472.028	Carol Webster	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S472.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S474.012	Geoffrey Hayes	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Change the sun angles proposed Daylight admission rules REr.17K, 18K and 19K [inferred].	Sun angles are crucial in Atawhai due to its East-to-West slopes. Building up another floor or two would prevent sunlight reaching some homes downhill from receiving sunlight until the afternoon. This has implications for home heating, as most people want to minimize their use of heating devices and to gain as much solar heat as possible. This is especially the case for fixed-income pensioners.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S474.013	Geoffrey Hayes	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Protect [private] sea views in Atawhai for existing homeowners [inferred].	Sea views are another reason that Atawhai is an attractive destination. Under intensification, some homeowners could lose their views. This would constitute a significant loss of amenity.	Reject	*Section 6*

S474.014	Geoffrey Hayes	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Require resource consent for proposed intensification in Atawhai to protect existing amenity values [inferred].	Some areas in Atawhai may be suitable for some intensification, but this should be done on an ad hoc basis and require resource consent to protect amenity values that attracted people to Atawhai in the first place. Intensification in Atawhai would have no impact on affordability, as household incomes are probably at or above the average for Nelson. There may be scope for low-income housing but it would need to be well-designed so as to avoid a concentration of poor or low income households. Only Kainga Ora can provide affordable housing for low or moderate income households. Infill housing should be permitted, subject to the current resource consent requirements. I do not object to infill housing where it is suitable and doesn't detract from amenity values.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S476.006	Gaile Noonan	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Provide] protection for the existing environment [and rules that avoid] removing any existing amenity from neighbouring sites.	Good design planning is critical, both for the building itself and the surrounding areas. Consideration of protecting existing environment and not building in a way that removes any existing amenity from neighbouring sites. Therefore new builds could potentially "swamp" an existing environment. Many people now work from home and many are retired. Both spend considerable hours at their home. These should not be compromised in the short term and must be allowed the free space, light, air and sunshine they currently enjoy for well-being.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.096	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	*Section 6*

S476.007	Gaile Noonan	Residential Zones	Not Stated	Amend references to the formerly named street "Hathaway Court" to "Hathaway Terrace" in Schedule G and any future documentation.	I refer to Schedule G -Trafalgar Street-Hathaway Court site. Hathaway Court was the street name until approximately 2009 when the street was renamed Hathaway Terrace. This needs to be corrected on any future documentation. Please note that Hathaway Court is the name of the resident complex bounded by Trafalgar Street, Hathaway Terrace and the Hathaway carpark.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS83.097	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Accept	*Section 6*
S477.001	Russell Baillie	Residential Zones	Oppose	Prevent intensification of properties on Ledbury Road [Atawhai].	We vehemently object to our superb views being completely ruined when obscured by any high rise buildings or additions to existing buildings. Plus our property value plummeting and ruining our property investment. Our wonderful views along with everybody else is why we chose to live in Atawhai. Also the prevention of sunlight by high rise buildings is unacceptable.	Reject	*Section 6*
S478.011	Nelson Airport Limited	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend Policy RE1.8.iii Rules that encourage a built-form which can better promote passive surveillance of streets and supporting a high quality built-form which minimises effects on neighbouring properties, as well as reverse sensitivity effects on nationally and/or regionally significant infrastructure.	Nelson Airport considers that it is essential that intensification occurs in an integrated, and well-considered manner that promotes well-functioning urban environments, as well as the health and wellbeing of residents, while also ensuring reverse sensitivity effects on large-scale, effects-generating infrastructure are well managed and minimised.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS51.011	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated		Oppose	Reject	The particular points of the submission we oppose are: All parts. The relief sought by NAL as to the requested change to Policy RE1.7 is considered to be unnecessary and inappropriate. It is considered that NAL are attempting here to impose additional control and influence (policy direction) over urban form outside of the Airport Effects Control Overlay. It is considered that NAL should be responsible for mitigating the adverse effects of its activities rather than imposing that mitigation on the receiving environment. In addition, the requested changes / relief sought should have been comprehensively addressed and justified (under section 32) as a part of PC30. As such, and given the importance of a fully integrated assessment, it is considered that PC29 and PC30 need to be heard together.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS83.108	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Oppose	Reject	No reason stated.	Accept	*Section 6*
S480.007	Yvonne Percy	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S480.008	Yvonne Percy	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S480.007.	Reject	*Section 6*
S480.009	Yvonne Percy	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S480.012	Yvonne Percy	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S480.014	Yvonne Percy	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S480.028	Yvonne Percy	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S480.027.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S481.007	Pip Swale	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings be built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	I am opposed to new 'green field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification without affecting existing suburbs. Infrastructure is easier and cheaper to develop on flat land and would provide more housing without affecting neighbouring properties.	Reject	*Section 6*
S481.009	Pip Swale	Residential Zones	Oppose	Include Daylight and Sunlight policy statement Para RE2.3.i: The reception of daylight and sunlight to each household unit is a critical component of residential amenity that provides warmth and energy efficiency and is vital for outdoor activities such as gardening and recreation.	Sunlight is an essential part of living in Nelson and why many people chose to live on the Tāhunanui Hills. Intensification on the Hill where many Hill properties already have shading issues directly from the hill is another reason for not having high density development on hills. The lack of sunlight could result in existing homes becoming dark and damp with associated mould and mildew.	Reject	*Section 6*
S483.003	Rachel Newton	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Recommend maximum double story building within the area Rutheford St boundary to Tasman St, including Nile St East to Selwyn Place Eastwards up to the base of the	This retains the views to Nelson's showcase of beautiful old character homes, mature trees & gardens.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS78.249	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Recommend maximum double storey building within the area Rutherford St boundary to Tasman St, including Nile St East to Selwyn Place Eastwards up to the base of the Grampians Hill. [This retains the views to Nelson's showcase of beautiful old character homes, mature trees & gardens.] Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new comprehensive independent study of the effects of this proposal on the character and heritage buildings of Nelson that informs changes to proposed rules and policies (on and off-site height, boundary set back, daylight angles). The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS65.268	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Recommend maximum double storey building within the area Rutherford St boundary to Tasman St, including Nile St East to Selwyn Place Eastwards up to the base of the Grampians Hill. [This retains the views to Nelson's showcase of beautiful old character homes, mature trees & gardens.] Reasons include (please also refer to our original submission #831 as in many cases multiple reasons have been noted): Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new study on effects of proposals on heritage and character of City is required. The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice. It has been undertaken by one person rather than a multidisciplinary team.	Reject	*Section 6*

S484.002	Philomena Donlon	Residential Zones	Neutral	Require all new buildings in Nelson to have solar panels incorporated into the roof and be insulated to a high standard.	Resilience, and self-sufficiency, ability to function after a weather event, low-cost power available for heating.	Reject	*Section 6*
S484.003	Philomena Donlon	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Require each dwelling has its own private outdoor space.	From my reading of the documentation round Plan 29, it looks like a private outdoor space is not compulsory in some cases. If I have misread, please ignore this. It's hard for me to imagine what living without a private outdoor space would be like . From hanging out laundry to growing herbs to storing sports-shoes, not to mention accommodating smokers/vapers or barbequing meat/fish, there are a heap of reasons why people need a private outdoor space. And being outside, however small the space, when you are confined to home, by a pandemic or by chronic illness.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS25.16	Port Nelson LTD		Oppose	Reject	This falls outside the scope of the plan change and the RMA.	Reject	*Section 6*
S485.003	Rose Biss and Jack Andrew	Residential Zones	Oppose	Retain Policy RE1.2(c).	New developments with higher density and particularly greater height and smaller yards should not be allowed as of right to impact negatively on existing residential development. The existing policy allows some consideration of amenity effects on neighbouring properties.	Accept	*Section 6*
S489.001	Michael de Vigne	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the maximum building height, daylight admission and site coverage rules in the General, Medium and High Density Residential zones [shown in Attachment 1 of the submission].	The 12m maximum height would deprive some neighbours of direct sunlight, especially during Winter making their houses cold, damp and unliveable. The proposed tall buildings would negatively affect neighbouring property values. 12m high buildings would look aesthetically out of place in a Medium Density Residential Zone. They would also obscure views and create parking issues.	Reject	*Section 6*

S492.007	Jonathan Chambers and Louisa Stoneham	Residential Zones	Oppose	That the GRZ respect and preserve the existing daylight admissions.	These have been carefully designed to provide adequate minimum daylight standards. Sunlight is one of the most valuable natural resources in Nelson, particularly in the winter months. The city has been shaped by its appreciation of the importance of sunlight. The current Nelson Resource Management Plan enshrines this understanding in black and white, and provides protection to existing properties from reallocation of this resource to new developments. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S492.008	Jonathan Chambers and Louisa Stoneham	Residential Zones	Not Stated	That an Urban Design Panel be established to oversee the quality of all future medium and high-density residential developments in Nelson.	So that goals and expectations driving the need for intensification can be clearly defined to ensure individual developments are truly fit for purpose, rather than being purely market driven. For example: - Ensuring developments provide a quota of affordable options for young kiwis - Ensuring all new developments are carbon-neutral. - Establishing community specific qualitative requirements [Refer to point 3.f in the original submission for more detail]	Accept	*Section 6*

S495.004	New Zealand Institute of Architects	Residential Zones	Amend	Develop a Nelson specific urban design guide.	Creating a Nelson specific urban design guide is one of the most effective methods of encouraging quality design outcomes without becoming overly restrictive. Urban design guides are useful for both permitted development (in that they provide guidance and methods for achieving good designs within the planning framework, which can be used by landowners and developers to assist their planning process), and for discretionary/controlled development, where the guides can be used by developers to understand the types of approaches that would be viewed favourably by council. Plus, they are a document that can form part of the assessment criteria in the resource consenting process. The design guides should be linked to the planning clauses so that anyone submitting for a resource consent will need to nominate how their design responds to the guides. There are a lot of examples of highly effective urban design guides such as the Auckland Design Manual or the Whangarei Urban Design Guidelines, the latter being a great example of how a city of similar size to Nelson has put qualitative guidelines in place. The urban design guide can be used to guide the implementation of the neighbourhood and block spatial plans.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS39.003	Richard Harden and Rachel Reese		Support	Accept	We agree with this submission point. Nelson City Council has neglected this work for many years and is out of step with good urban design practice.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS56.060	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support in part	Accept in part	Kāinga Ora supports the development of an urban design guide provided that such guidance is non-statutory and used as a tool to inform assessment, but not located in the Plan with commensurate weighting, so as to avoid the Design Guide acting as a quasi-set of additional rules, as opposed to providing guidance. Kāinga Ora would prefer that specific design matters be articulated clearly in Plan rules, rather than requiring consistency with a design guide.	Reject	*Section 6*
S495.006	New Zealand Institute of Architects	Residential Zones	Amend	1. [Set] Minimum Dwelling Standards which include key metrics that must be met for units, such as: Functional layout Room depth Windows Storage Ventilation Private open space Accessibility.	Minimum Dwelling Standards ensure that poor quality units are avoided and new dwellings have sufficient internal amenity. Having minimum unit sizes is insufficient to ensure that the resulting dwellings are of suitable quality and further controls are required to produce liveable homes. For example, saddle bag apartments may technically meet the planning rules however they result in poor amenity for the occupants and should be avoided. The Auckland Design Manual includes dwelling standards within their design guide, as does the Better Apartments Design Standards in Melbourne (sic).	Reject	*Section 6*
FS56.062	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora opposes the imposition of these additions to the minimum dwelling standards. The minimum dwelling sizes combined with other rules including for outlook, yards, and recession planes are sufficient to ensure a good standard of residential accommodation whilst enabling intensification and housing choice. Some of the provisions requested by submitter are covered by other legislation such as the Building Act and should not be duplicated in the Plan.	Accept	*Section 6*

S495.007	New Zealand Institute of Architects	Residential Zones	Amend	Adopt overlooking controls.	In an urban environment the two primary amenity impacts on neighbouring dwellings are overshadowing and overlooking. Overshadowing is being addressed through height, setback and recession plane rules however there doesn't appear to be any controls managing overlooking and privacy. We recommend the adoption of overlooking controls to ensure habitable spaces remain private and are not adversely impacted by views from neighbouring buildings. Victoria has overlooking standards in place which could be reviewed for inclusion in this plan change.. One of the benefits of this control is that it encourages windows and habitable rooms to be on the street facing and back yard facing sides of the development, which discourages 'sausage flat' typologies where units are directed towards the sides of the property and towards the neighbours. If side facing windows are required or windows that would otherwise look into neighbouring units then these can be managed through offsetting the windows, raising them above eye level or providing screening.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
FS56.063	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	No further controls are considered necessary as other rules (e.g. setbacks, height, height in relation to boundary controls) are sufficient to ensure residential amenity is maintained.	Reject	*Section 6*

S495.012	New Zealand Institute of Architects	Residential Zones	Amend	Put in place universal design controls [or permitted standards] for all three new residential zones, rather than having rules that are specific to Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone only.	The General Density Residential Zone (GDRZ) does not have minimum unit size controls, whereas the MDRZ & HDRZ do. As noted above, we recommend that dwelling standards be created which would remove the need to have minimum unit sizes, however we also suggest that whatever controls are put in place should be universal rather than specific to one or two of the new zones. There doesn't appear to be a rationale as to why the GDRZ doesn't have controls over this (sic) and there is a risk of sub-standard dwellings being built as a result.	Reject	*Section 6*
S495.013	New Zealand Institute of Architects	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend the outlook space permitted standards [REr.17L, 18L and 19L] to require a 6x4m outlook from the primary living space and 2x2m outlook from all other habitable rooms.	Outlook space is limited to 4x4m for the principal living area and 1x1m for bedrooms. We recommend increasing this as it is insufficient to allow for good amenity to dwellings and suggests a much denser settlement pattern than is suitable in the GDRZ, MDRZ & HDRZ. By way of example the Auckland Unitary Plan requires 6x4m outlook from the principal living room, 3x3m outlook from the principal bedroom and 1x1m outlook from all other habitable rooms. We suggest that a 6x4m outlook from the primary living space and 2x2m outlook from all other habitable rooms is suitable in Nelson.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS56.066	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought and does not consider an increase to outlook space is required. As outlined in the primary submission, Kāinga Ora seeks amendment to these rules to include notification preclusions (both public and limited notification) where compliance with outlook space is not achieved. Kāinga Ora also seeks amendments to the matters of discretion, to remove privacy effects on neighbouring sites, because this standard is an onsite amenity control, with other standards managing offsite amenity outcomes (e.g. setbacks, height, height in relation to boundary controls)	Accept	*Section 6*
S495.014	New Zealand Institute of Architects	Residential Zones	Amend	[Consider] whether to include a waste management report as a requirement for resource consent applications for developments with more than three units	Not stated.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S496.005	Alan York	Residential Zones	Not Stated	Holiday homes should be subject to minimum occupation periods per year.	Holiday homes that sit empty for long periods do not contribute to availability and affordability of housing.	Reject	*Section 6*
S498.005	Nelson Tasman 2050	Residential Zones	Amend	Prior to the completion of neighbourhood plans revise the standards to concentrate higher density development along street fronts.	So these developments can utilise the amenity of the road reserve. Refer to reasons in submission point S498.004.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS47.008	Wainui Properties Limited		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: the interim targeted approach. Nelson Tasman 2050, as with many other submitters, consider that a spatial neighbourhood plan is required. However, Nelson Tasman 2050 considers that would take years to come into effect. We agree. In the interim, Nelson Tasman 2050 express their support for areas with "advantageous orientation for outlook and amenity and thereby concentrating higher density development along the street fronts so these developments can utilise the amenity of the road reserve". The land at 137-155 Nile Street is considered to have these attributes. In then event that PC29 does not proceed in its current form, it is considered that the site at 137-155 Nile Street should not be discounted as this is a valuable intensification opportunity which could contribute significantly (in the interim) to achieve the intensification objective.	Reject	*Section 6*
S498.006	Nelson Tasman 2050	Residential Zones	Amend	1. [Set] Minimum Dwelling Standards which include key metrics that must be met for units, such as: Functional layout Room depth Windows Storage Ventilation Private open space Accessibility.	Minimum Dwelling Standards ensure that poor quality units are avoided and new dwellings have sufficient internal amenity. Having minimum unit sizes is insufficient to ensure that the resulting dwellings are of suitable quality and further controls are required to produce liveable homes. For example, saddle bag apartments may technically meet the planning rules however they result in poor amenity for the occupants and should be avoided. The Auckland Design Manual includes dwelling standards within their design guide, as does the Better Apartments Design Standards in Melbourne (sic).	Reject	*Section 6*

FS56.070	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought. The minimum dwelling sizes combined with other rules including for outlook, yards, and recession planes are sufficient to ensure a good standard of residential accommodation whilst enabling intensification and housing choice. Some of the provisions requested by submitter are covered by other legislation such as the Building Act and should not be duplicated in the Plan.	Accept	*Section 6*
S498.007	Nelson Tasman 2050	Entire Plan Change	Amend	[Create] a Nelson specific Urban Design Guide to provide guidance and methods for achieving permitted development and form part of the assessment criteria in the resource consenting process.	Urban Design Guide is one of the most effective methods of encouraging quality design outcomes without becoming overly restrictive... they provide guidance and methods for achieving good designs within the planning framework, which can be used by landowners and developers to assist their planning process... and can be used by developers to understand the types of approaches that would be viewed favourably by council. The design guides should be linked to the planning clauses so that anyone submitting for resource consent will need to nominate how their design responds to the guides. There are a lot of examples of highly effective urban design guides such as the Auckland Design Manual or the Whangarei Urban Design Guidelines. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S498.011	Nelson Tasman 2050	Residential Zones	Amend	Nelson Urban Design Guidelines [requested in submission point S498.007] should encompass a dedicated section addressing materials and energy, with a focus on mitigating both embodied and operational carbon and incorporating robust recommendations for new building designs aimed at minimising their	While urban intensification can significantly reduce long-term carbon emissions, especially in the realm of transportation, it is imperative to acknowledge the substantial carbon impact associated with demolition and new construction.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS32.012	Peter Olorenshaw		Oppose in part	Reject in part	Evidence shows that the low carbon option is actually to demolish existing houses in well located areas despite having to create emissions rebuilding with multiple new houses. This is because the population growth needs to be accommodated somewhere - houses are going to be built. It is far better to build them in places with existing infrastructure and where people can easily walk, bike or bus to their daily travel needs. Having these new houses built on the periphery of existing urban areas is the worst outcome for trying to get coverage from buses (more viable, more frequent, more useful, more attractive the denser the urban areas are), for having bike commuting a viable option and for km of pipelines, trenching roading to build in the first place and maintain in perpetuity. Here is a reference to a UK study that finds it is substantially better to demolish an existing centrally located house and build multiple dwellings than keep that one house and build the rest on the periphery: https://green-alliance.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/Build-up.pdf	Accept	*Section 6*

S498.013	Nelson Tasman 2050	Residential Zones	Amend	• Consider incorporating into PC29, Nelson's Urban Design Guidelines and the eventual design of spatial neighbourhood plans recommendations from the following reports relating to urban green space: Sponge Cities, Can they help us survive more intense rainfall? Kali Mercier on behalf of Mahi A Rongo/ The Helen Clark Foundation, August 2023. Are we building harder, hotter cities? The vital importance of urban green spaces, Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, March 2023.	The Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment Simon Upton identified the loss of green spaces in New Zealand's towns and cities due to backyard infill development as problematic. He highlighted that new government rules, such as the Medium Density Residential Standards (aimed at promoting housing intensification), would likely add to this pressure. He urged that green spaces should not be optional and emphasises the environmental benefits of urban parks, reserves, gardens, vegetation, and street trees. While Upton supports intensification, he emphasised that not all intensification is the same, and that the style of infill townhouse development that is currently happening within our cities comes with risks for the existing network of urban green space.	Reject	*Section 6*
S500.012	Euan Laird	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Oppose allowing 3-6 storey buildings 1m from the boundary in residential zones].	There is a direct link between the built environment and subjective well-being [being] mental health. The possibility of three or six storey buildings within a metre of residential boundaries may cause sunlight deprivation and shade solar panelling leading to inefficiency and higher energy costs. Existing properties would be overlooked and this results in an invasion of privacy. Such outcomes may well lead to a drop in the value of a resident's largest asset, is/her/their home, and this is hardly conducive to mental well-being. [Refer to point 15 in the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S503.003	Susan Capenerhurst	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	The basic premise is that the daylight and sunlight received on a residential site should be no different whether or not the neighbour is residential. This philosophy applies whether the building is on an adjoining site or across a street.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.115	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	*Section 6*

S504.003	Richard Capenerhurst	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	The basic premise is that the daylight and sunlight received on a residential site should be no different whether or not the neighbour is residential. This philosophy applies whether the building is on an adjoining site or across a street.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.124	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	*Section 6*
S505.005	Stuart and Sally Hanchet	Residential Zones	Not Stated	[Seeks] council to ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings be built on all new greenfield developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Infrastructure is easier and cheaper to develop on flat land and would provide more housing without affecting neighbouring properties.	Reject	*Section 6*
S505.007	Stuart and Sally Hanchet	Residential Zones	Support in part	Support the inclusion of Daylight and Sunlight policy statement Para RE2.3.i.	The reception of daylight and sunlight to each household unit is a critical component of residential amenity that provides warmth and energy efficiency, and is vital for outdoor activities such as gardening and recreation.	Accept	*Section 6*
S506.003	Gwen Daly	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Create] a plan for the city which includes allocated areas for residents to use as their communal gardens.	Large blocks of land with space to provide a garden for residents such as are currently provided by places such as the wood retirement home, which gives people a healthy environments to live in.	Reject	*Section 6*
S510.006	Adrian Parlane	Residential Zones	Amend	Request a minimum side and rear yard setback of 1.5 metres. [Refer to the Petition attached to this submission for the 70 signatories in support of this submission]	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S512.003	Nelson Tasman Climate Forum	Residential Zones	Amend	Include efficient use of resources as an assessment criterion for residential units in the residential, inner city and suburban commercial zone.	It should be signalled to all developers that building efficiently matters - just in the materials that they use, but also in the way they make use of space.	Reject	*Section 6*
S512.007	Nelson Tasman Climate Forum	Residential Zones	Amend	Allow perimeter block housing on streets with road frontage, where building out to the boundaries is permitted and accepted by neighbours either side	Refer to reasons in submission point S512.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S512.009	Nelson Tasman Climate Forum	Residential Zones	Amend	Support all paving on suburban sections to be permeable.	Refer to reasons in submission point S512.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S512.015	Nelson Tasman Climate Forum	Residential Zones	Support	Support the increase to allow three residential units as apermitted activity per site.	With more people interested in living in tiny houses or in simple sleepouts, allowing three residential units enables more households to help out with the housing crisis by providing extra housing on existing sites.	Accept	*Section 6*
S512.016	Nelson Tasman Climate Forum	Residential Zones	Support	Support the requirement for developments with 10 or moreunits to have at least 10% accessible units on theground floor	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS56.074	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora does not support the requirement to include 10% wheelchair accessible units where 10+ units are provided. Not every development or site is appropriate for wheelchair housing and imposing such a blanket control would be too restrictive.	Accept	*Section 6*
S514.003	Nicholas Adams	Residential Zones	Oppose	Consider other ways to solve the problem of lack of housing aside from a potential blanket of 6 story apartments.	For instance if multi story buildings are to built then consider how they could be built to allow visual and physical avenues for sunlight, distance views and greenery. If this was done well it could achieve most of what is needed. The biggest effects of increasing the heights of residential housing to 3 or 6 stories are: The future reduction of sunlight to neighboring properties and to most of the inhabitants within the new buildings. This will be particularly negative during winter months. A big reduction in views of green-scapes. Currently the view I have is of the Matai hills and a general surrounding vista of trees. There is considerable evidence that green-scapes have considerable positive mental and physical health outcomes. These studies have that differing socio-economic conditions from neighborhood to neighborhood are not a factor. Potentially there will little or no natural avenues to allow light, greenery and views to permeate to all dwelling.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S514.005	Nicholas Adams	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Make] the definition of recession planes clearer. Example drawings would help explain.	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

S515.007	Steven Langford	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S515.008	Steven Langford	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S515.007.	Reject	*Section 6*
S515.009	Steven Langford	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S515.012	Steven Langford	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S515.014	Steven Langford	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S515.028	Steven Langford	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S515.027.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S516.004	Margaret Soderberg	Residential Zones	Not Stated	[Request] the highest level of residential intensification outside current CBD to be two x 2 storey houses on one section with amenity controls and resource consent required. [if the	Refer to reasons in submission point S516.001.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS83.134	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	*Section 6*
S516.005	Margaret Soderberg	Residential Zones	Not Stated	[Request that rules are developed] to allow 2 dwellings within one house in larger properties with amenity controls in NRMP, if the Plan Change proceeds	Refer to reasons in submission point S516.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.135	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	*Section 6*
S516.006	Margaret Soderberg	Residential Zones	Not Stated	Retain the daylight controls to provide sunlight and daylight requirements, [if the Plan Change proceeds]	Refer to reasons in submission point S516.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.136	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	*Section 6*
S516.011	Margaret Soderberg	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Request, if the Plan Change proceeds] retain existing amenity controls in residential zones, including setbacks and daylight controls	Refer to reasons in submission point S516.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.141	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	*Section 6*
S516.021	Margaret Soderberg	Residential Zones	Oppose	Support a level of intensification that would allow an additional 2-bedroom housing unit on existing properties and there are some very good examples of residential intensification in Nelson. These have been carefully planned and designed. Most are 1, 2 or 3 storey where a series of town houses replace old poorly insulated, poorly built houses. These areas	Not stated.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
FS83.143	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S517.009	Megan Courtney	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend [policy] RE2.9 as follows:*Enable development of existing or new sites to create a level of amenity for residents within and adjoining a development that reflects the*	This is more reflective of the policy direction of the NPS Urban Development.	Reject	*Section 6*
S517.010	Megan Courtney	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend objective RE1 to better reflect the changes to PC29 as follows:*Provide a diversity of residential styles based on the differing characteristics of areas of the city, and differing*	This better reflects the policy direction of the NPS Urban Development and provides a clearer direction for the new policies introduced via PC29.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S520.002	Vanessa Hardinge	Residential Zones	Oppose	Retain existing daylight admission protection rules for all pre-existing properties.	I strongly urge the council to reconsider these changes and allow any future development under the existing regulations and ask the Council to maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules for all pre-existing properties. This will allow pedestrians (tourists and residents) to continue to have a view of the sea while they walk around the neighbourhood. This harbourfront neighbourhood should be preserved as a proud symbol of Nelson.	Reject	*Section 6*
S524.005	Paul Barter	Residential Zones	Not Stated	Consider allowing the construction of "granny flats" on existing properties without the need for resource consent.	To encourage intensification and provide more housing options, This approach not only supports sustainable living but also maintains the character of the neighbourhoods.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS38.007	Small Time Developments		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support in part are: Consider allowing the construction of "granny flats"on existing properties without the need for resource consent. Agree with the intent of this submission to encourage infill in a less intrusive manner, but perhaps the change to 3 dwellings will address this. Not every site will be developed intensively so the granny flat option will be available under this new rule.	Accept	*Section 6*
S524.006	Paul Barter	Residential Zones	Not Stated	Protect access to sunlight for existing and future residents.	Nelson is renowned for its high annual sunshine hours. The proposed changes could preclude homeowners from installing solar panels and growing their own vegetables due to reduced sunlight. The Council should prioritize sustainability.	Reject	*Section 6*
S530.002	Daniel Jackson	Residential Zones	Amend	Allow people to build up to the boundary.	People should be able to build up to the boundary, at least if they comply with the recession planes. Having houses built close together or indeed with shared walls is very common in other countries. This is a great way to enable greater intensification and can reduce the need to build up if people are concerned with that.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S530.003	Daniel Jackson	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Remove or substantially reduce the site coverage restrictions.	The limits on site coverage should be removed or at least the site coverage proportion substantially increased. The extent to which people want gardens or outdoor space various considerably. Some people may prefer not to have a garden or outdoor area to maintain, but to do their outdoor recreation elsewhere in public parks and areas. Allowing greater site coverage substantially increases the housing that is possible on a section and may mitigate the need to build high where people are concerned about that.	Reject	*Section 6*
S530.004	Daniel Jackson	Residential Zones	Support	Maintain the ability to have three dwellings per title as of right.	The proposal to allow three dwellings per title as of right is important. It will allow partitioning of properties and the building of flats. It enables intensification without building up where that is not wanted.	Reject	*Section 6*
S530.005	Daniel Jackson	Residential Zones	Support in part	Three stories should be allowed everywhere. Apart from this, the height limits and zones should be maintained as proposed [with the exception of the inner city zone, refer to submission point S530.006].	Three stories should be allowed everywhere, It enables medium density housing, as has been successfully done in many suburbs in cities like Auckland and overseas. Allowing it, everywhere will enable us to solve our housing crisis and reduce sprawl, with its attendant costs in terms of carbon emissions, congestion and infrastructure.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS5.027	Warwick Rogers		Oppose	Reject	3 Stories are just too high, everyone will be living in sunless slums. Even most of the so call medium zone is just too much and not needed.	Accept	*Section 6*

S531.007	David Collier	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: • Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. • Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. • Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. • Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. • Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. • Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. • Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S531.008	David Collier	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S531.007.	Reject	*Section 6*
S531.009	David Collier	Residential Zones	Oppose	following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of privacy as well as	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S531.012	David Collier	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S531.014	David Collier	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S531.026	David Collier	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S531.027.	Reject	*Section 6*

S532.004	Kerry Haycock	Residential Zones	Support	Support increased density of housing in existing residential neighbourhoods through 2-storey apartments and subdivided sections for low-level builds [inferred].	The density of housing can be increased in these areas without the need for such tall high-rise developments. There is an opportunity to enhance these neighbourhoods with, for example, 2-story apartments and subdivided sections for low-level builds. This would enable progress in housing development without sacrificing the current appeal of the neighbourhoods and in a way that would be more considerate and reasonable to the existing residents. It would also be more consistent with the 3-story proposals in the Draft Nelson Plan. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S534.001	Lynette Nicholas	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Adequately consider shading effects on neighbouring properties.	I am writing to express my strong opposition to Plan Change 29, which proposes housing intensification in various zones throughout the city. While I appreciate the need for responsible urban and residential development, I believe that the current plan lacks consideration for crucial factors, such as preserving sunlight, maintaining privacy for existing residents, and promoting sustainable living. The proposal for Medium- and High-Density Residential Zones, which allows for three and six-story buildings, raises serious concerns regarding the loss of sunlight to neighbouring properties.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S534.002	Lynette Nicholas	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Increase the distances to bordering properties [yard setbacks in rules REr.17E, 18E and 19E].	The proposed distances to bordering properties [yard setbacks in rules REr.17E, 18E and 19E] are far too small and should be increased to mitigate adverse effects.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S534.007	Lynette Nicholas	Residential Zones	Amend	Consider allowing the construction of "granny flats" on existing properties without the need for resource consent.	To encourage intensification and provide more housing options, the Council should consider allowing the construction of "granny flats" on existing properties without the need for resource consent. This approach not only supports sustainable living but also maintains the character of the neighbourhoods.	Accept	*Section 6*

FS38.008	Small Time Developments		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support in part are: Consider allowing the construction of "granny flats"on existing properties without the need for resource consent. Agree with the intent of this submission to encourage infill in a less intrusive manner, but perhaps the change to 3 dwellings will address this. Not every site will be developed intensively so the granny flat option will be available under this new rule.	Accept	*Section 6*
S534.008	Lynette Nicholas	Residential Zones	Amend	Protect access to sunlight for existing and future residents.	Nelson is renowned for its high annual sunshine hours. The proposed changes could preclude homeowners from installing solar panels and growing their own vegetables due to reduced sunlight. The Council should prioritize sustainability by protecting access to sunlight for existing and future residents.	Reject	*Section 6*
S535.007	Hamish Barker	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. To allow such tall buildings to completely overshadow even the neighbouring section is completely unfair. In every other aspect of building, the building code requires the other property not be adversely affect, for example: seismic movement, external spread of fire, noise, and stormwater. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S535.008	Hamish Barker	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S535.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S535.009	Hamish Barker	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S535.012	Hamish Barker	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S535.028	Hamish Barker	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point s535.027.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S536.009	Leah Collier	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S536.010	Leah Collier	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S536.009.	Accept	*Section 6*
S536.011	Leah Collier	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*

S536.014	Leah Collier	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification. If the likes of Berryfields was built into 6 story buildings at the start, across the whole development I would not have minded one bit, at least then it would have been in one area and before buying you'd have known what you were getting yourself into.	Reject	*Section 6*
S536.016	Leah Collier	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S536.017	Leah Collier	Residential Zones	Oppose	Amend the rules to allow bigger properties to more easily be divided into multi-dwellings [inferred].	Bigger older properties, could be better utilised and help with our growth if they were more easily allowed to be divided into multi-dwellings.	Accept	*Section 6*
S536.031	Leah Collier	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S536.030.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S537.001	Gardner Bickford	Residential Zones	Amend	Reconsider the minimum balcony size for upper-level residential units.	I'm writing to express my support for Plan Change 29, but also to advocate for the courageous steps we can take to ensure a better, more inclusive future for Nelson. Balconies are more than just architectural features; they're small gateways to wellbeing, allowing people to connect with the outdoors. Small balconies can be both practical and delightful, much like you'd see in many international cities. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S537.002	Gardner Bickford	Residential Zones	Amend	Remove the mandated minimum size for studio and one-bedroom homes. Instead, I propose we defer to established regulations like the Housing Improvement Regulations Act of 1947	Flexibility can be a catalyst for affordability and inclusivity.	Reject	*Section 6*

S538.002	Alice Hill	Residential Zones	Support	I support intensification across all residential zones.	Nelson needs more housing AS LONG AS ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORT CORRIDORS CAN ACCOMMODATE THE INCREASED POPULATION IT SERVES. I believe densification is critical and I support visionary and bold steps to make that happen. I also realise I'm in a position of privilege living in Tahuna with a sea view - this is a resource that should be able to be enjoyed by as many Nelsonians as wish to live here.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS28.120	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: I support intensification across all residential zones. The Tahunanui (flat) and Monaco residential areas are largely outside the PC29 boundaries and comprise either standard residential or low-density zoning. Applying a general residential zoning across all existing residential zones would provide for up to 3 residential units per site as a permitted activity. However, there are a number of areas that are not appropriate for further residential intensification, in particular those areas subject to the Nelson Airport Overlays.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS78.297	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Support intensification across all residential zones. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS65.326	Heritage Nelson		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission we oppose is: Support intensification across all residential zones. Reasons include (please also refer to our original submission #831 as in many cases multiple reasons have been noted): PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources.	Reject	*Section 6*

S539.002	Shannon Gourley	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the change to daylight hours.	The proposed plan will allow the potential of a 19m building going up either side of an already placed single story. Daylight hours reduced will then mean that house now has no way to use solar panels to help with the environment with power. Growing of their own food in the garden due to lack of sun entering that property causing older home to now be cold, damp due to the lack of sunlight causing more of an issue of unhealthy homes. has there been a social impact study done?	Reject	*Section 6*
S539.003	Shannon Gourley	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose rear and side yard [setback] changes.	Boundary distances being narrowed created lack of air flow and noise issues. The increased land coverage on a property means more need for larger storm water systems. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S539.004	Shannon Gourley	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the increase of residential units without neighbours being notified.	Residential units without neighbors being notified will have a large impact on street parking and safety. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S540.007	Alexandra Cotton	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S540.008	Alexandra Cotton	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S540.007.	Accept	*Section 6*

S540.009	Alexandra Cotton	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S540.012	Alexandra Cotton	Residential Zones	Oppose	Consider building two storey dwellings on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	I am opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S540.014	Alexandra Cotton	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S542.004	Susannah Roddick	Residential Zones	Oppose	Provide local examples of well-developed low rise and identify current barriers to achieving this form of development [inferred].	I do not see local examples in the plan of low rise that is well-developed, so it is hard to imagine, and the revised plan should identify what the current barriers are to this in Nelson. I ask that the NCC present clear information on how low-rise buildings might look, and ensure a good proportion are also affordable. Otherwise, why bother? The NCC plan should promote good examples, explore why they're not common now, and inform us on ow they could be well-developed and livable.	Reject	*Section 6*
S542.005	Susannah Roddick	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Create] incentives or removing barrier for residents to replace one large home with multiple homes, as long as this meets the daylight, sun, amenity values as per Urban design.	The NCC has to avoid the risk of creating any incentives for people to only sell to a developer, who'd then create high rise, which would then would lead to adjacent neighbours finding that they had no choice but to do likewise, because who'd buy a 1-2 storey place behind a 6 storey place? Only a developer would do that. I'd welcome creating incentives or removing barrier for residents to replace one large home with multiple homes, as long as this meets the daylight, sun, amenity values as per Urban design.	Reject	*Section 6*
S542.008	Susannah Roddick	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Require] a minimum of 2 storeys on greenfield sites.	I support a minimum of 2 storeys on greenfield sites.	Reject	*Section 6*

S543.004	Paul Searle	Residential Zones	Support in part	[Enable] moderate infill with town houses and granny flats [with appropriate setbacks].	I would support carefully relaxed setbacks to allow moderate infill with town houses and granny flats, to allow multi-generational living.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS38.009	Small Time Developments		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support in part are: [Enable] moderate infill with town houses and granny flats [with appropriate setbacks]. Agree with the intent of this submission to encourage infill in a less intrusive manner, but perhaps the change to 3 dwellings will address this. Not every site will be developed intensively so the granny flat option will be available under this new rule.	Accept	*Section 6*
S544.007	Andrea Papai	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S544.008	Andrea Papai	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP.	Refer to reasons in submission point S544.007. As the crow flies, we live 25 metres away from a Kainga Ora property (4 Examiner/57 Wellington Street which is HDZ under PC 29). I have talked to Kainga Ora and they have told me that that development is on hold until until the outcome of PC 29. One can only imagine that they only want to go higher than their original plan of 3-storeys!?! While I understand the need for social housing, it would be not right and very unfair to cause the loss of the current sunshine we get and to put us in shade! Please note, in the winter, we lose the sun behind the Mount Street Hill in the early afternoon. We don't won't to lose it in the morning also!	Accept	*Section 6*
S544.009	Andrea Papai	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S544.011	Andrea Papai	Mapping	Oppose	Apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district.	Bigger older properties, could be better utilised and help with our growth if they were more easily allowed to be divided into multi-dwellings. AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules will apply to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS28.037	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Apply new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson District. The Tahunanui (flat) and Monaco residential areas are largely outside the PC29 boundaries and comprise either standard residential or low-density zoning. Applying a general residential zoning across all existing residential zones would provide for up to 3 residential units per site as a permitted activity. However, there are a number of areas that are not appropriate for further residential intensification, in particular those areas subject to the Nelson Airport Overlays.	Accept	*Section 6*
S544.012	Andrea Papai	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S544.014	Andrea Papai	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S544.026	Andrea Papai	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property.	Refer to reasons in submission point S544.025. We would not like to further lose our privacy and peacefulness either and have more people looking down on us and making noise on our street and nearby streets. We already have enough drunk people causing damage and disruption on narrow Locking Street. A big social housing block in our area isn't going to make things better.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S544.031	Andrea Papai	Residential Zones	Oppose	Enable intensification through single storey tiny homes or granny flats on exiting properties without blocking sun or views from adjacent properties.	I would like to it made easier for a tiny home or a granny flat be added to existing properties so intensification is done with blocking people's sun and views. These would be single storey.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

FS38.010	Small Time Developments		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support in part are: Enable intensification through single storey tiny homes or granny flats on exiting properties without blocking sun or views from adjacent properties. Agree with the intent of this submission to encourage infill in a less intrusive manner, but perhaps the change to 3 dwellings will address this. Not every site will be developed intensively so the granny flat option will be available under this new rule.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S546.006	Michelle Collier	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S546.007	Michelle Collier	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S546.006.	Accept	*Section 6*
S546.008	Michelle Collier	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*

S546.011	Michelle Collier	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S546.013	Michelle Collier	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S546.026	Michelle Collier	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S546.025.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S551.004	Jude Osborne	Residential Zones	Oppose	Protect existing property's access to sunlight.	All existing properties need to be protected in terms of their access to light - to warm their homes, utilise their access to sunlight for solar, heating homes and maintaining their gardens and outdoor activities. Housing intensification should not come at the cost of the quality and wellbeing of existing residents.	Reject	*Section 6*
S553.001	Leo Barrer	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Increase protections within the plan change for residents to challenge adjacent developments on the grounds of losing access to sunlight or outlook, including the ability to potentially halt developments that negatively impact their	To protect the character and live-ability of Nelson.	Reject	*Section 6*

S555.006	Gerrard Wilson	Residential Zones	Amend	• Review and amend the standards and rules proposed for each residential zone to ensure that they: are more consistent with Nelsons status as a Tier 2 city; are individually workable and practical; adequately protect residential amenity, particularly shading and sunlight access; work as a package of controls for each zone, including deleting unnecessary or excessive rules, to ensure the methods of the Residential zones achieve the outcomes sought for the zone.	In broad terms, there is inconsistency in the proposed PC29 planning controls in that they are exceedingly permissive on some aspects (density, height limits and site coverage for example) yet excessively prescriptive and somewhat contradictory on other controls (front yards and parking generally but also physical items such as cycle parking, and vehicle charging for example). The emphasis on certain controls appears to be at the cost protection of amenity and given the extensive nature of the proposed changes will invariably result in some perverse and / or unexpected outcomes. Moreover, such an interventionalist approach is not only poor planning practice but is ultra vires in that it strays beyond resource management into the territory of the Building Act and Building Code. It is questionable whether a 200m2 minimum site size, as proposed through the subdivision provision of the proposed Plan Change, can practically achieve all of the development controls proposed for the residential zones through Plan Change 29. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S556.001	David Hazard	Residential Zones	Neutral	[Increase the permeable landscaped area requirement from 20% of the site to 30%].	A large portion of Nelsons properties suitable for development currently have a much higher permeable surface. There is scope for huge reductions in permeable surfaces which drastically increase the likely hood of flash flooding. The rule should be increased from 20% to 30%.	Reject	*Section 6*
S556.003	David Hazard	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Amend the plan to require] a minimum of two storey dwellings to be built on all new green field developments - e.g. Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	I am strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*

S557.003	Rose Biss	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Retain Residential Policy RE1.2(c) for Tahunanui Hills.	The existing policy RE1.2(c) provides for consideration of effects on neighbouring properties. Its a sound policy and should be retained. New developments with high density and particularly greater height and small yards should not be allowed as of right to affect negatively on existing residential development.	Accept	*Section 6*
S558.001	Anne Dickinson	Residential Zones	Not Stated	Keep builds no higher than 3 stories. For neighbouring properties to be asked to give their say on a build within 2-30 meters of their property.	Density of people in housing is a major mental health hazard. I say that to have density of people/housing this will effect people severely/immensely. Business NZ and Southern Cross Health Society in 2017 said stress and anxiety in the workplace in the western world has increased dramatically in the last few years. At an NGO conference 2023, I attended recently, the CEO of Whenua Iti announced the suicide rate is higher than people being killed on the roads!	Reject	*Section 6*
S560.002	Jane Bayley	Residential Zones	Oppose	Retain 7.5m height control as a permitted standard [for the General Residential Zone].	Oppose the increase to permitted building height from 7.5m to 8m. The current height restriction is appropriate for the residential zone to be able to build a 2 storey dwelling without impact daylight or privacy of neighbours.	Reject	*Section 6*
S560.005	Jane Bayley	Residential Zones	Oppose	Retain the existing daylight angles [from AP15 and REr.35] for the General Residential Zone.	Sunshine hours within a property is considered in NZ to be a common right. Around NZ this has historically be achieved through using adjustable angles based on the property boundary positions. The proposal removes this and is creating a higher angle and a 360 common angle which does not take into the effects of the suns pattern Council is failing its community by reducing daylight angles in a city which prides itself and markets itself on being the sunshine capital. Seek to retain the existing daylight angles for the General Residential Zone.	Reject	*Section 6*
S560.020	Jane Bayley	Residential Zones	Support in part	Support General Residential having 3 residential units per allotment provided one on site carpark is provided per unit	Refer to reasons in submission point S560.011.	Accept	*Section 6*

S561.005	Kirsten Brown	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend the plan change to retain [or introduce] some consideration of views, outlook and green spaces.	Policy RE1.2 - Flexibility in Development I am quite concerned that the requirement for new / intensifying development to avoid significantly affecting the views and outlook from adjacent properties has been struck out completely. Access to some degree of a view, the sky, and/ or green space are very important to support good mental health. The consideration of views, outlooks, and green spaces needs to be even more carefully accounted for when planning for higher residential density to avoid "concrete jungle" or "Soviet" like outcomes. While a property's outlook may be compromised by intensification, controls must remain to make sure it is not destroyed entirely. Completely omitting the requirement to consider the outlook of neighbouring sites also has the potential to significantly decrease property values. In some situations, this may unfairly disadvantage existing landowners / mortgage holders while lining the pockets of large-scale property developers.	Reject	*Section 6*
S562.018	Hugh Short	Residential Zones	Oppose	Any applications for more intensive development should be publicly notified to affected neighbors and in some instances to the wider public.	We consider that if the proposed High Density Zoning is confirmed it would enable a large development capacity as of right. One of the Council's core responsibilities is to manage infrastructure capability to enable development within their district while protecting the unique character, environment and amenity for both current and future residents and not enabling third parties to make these decisions.	Reject	*Section 6*

S563.003	Meagan O'Brien	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Require] full written consent from affected parties if a building will affect the sunlight in a neighbouring property.	Sunshine is important for people's moods. Being shaded by a building increases heating costs, reduces solar power capacity, decreases the amount of time that people spend outside getting fresh air and makes them depressed and lowers their immune system due to lowered vitamin D. Having high buildings in current residential zones is not a good plan. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S563.005	Meagan O'Brien	Residential Zones	Oppose	Require written permission from all affected parties where a building will affect their privacy.	We are accustomed to a certain level of privacy and pay accordingly when purchasing a property. The proposed plan change will dramatically change this. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S563.006	Meagan O'Brien	Residential Zones	Oppose	Consider the negative effects of social housing [inferred].	I have worked in a social worker role before, so I understand the needs of people to have a house to live in. I also understand some of the stresses and situations that lead people into homelessness as well as the associated issues. While I love supporting these people, I chose not to live next to Franklyn village as I wouldn't feel safe raising a family next door to place like this. Franklyn village can evict tenants if necessary. I have heard that tenants in social housing developments cannot be evicted, so that they are actually worse to live next door than somewhere like Franklyn village. If Kainga Ora places are smoke free then where are the residents and their guests going to smoke? Probably on the street. This will make me feel unsafe with my children travelling to and from school. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S563.007	Meagan O'Brien	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Discourage the use of] imported pre-fabricated buildings.	One model for building that Kainga Ora are using is importing pre-fabricated buildings from Vietnam and building them up like lego. This is completely unsustainable, bad for the environment, disgustingly ugly and utterly illogical. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S563.009	Meagan O'Brien	Residential Zones	Oppose	Require trees to be planted around the outside of new developments.	I suggest that there be some regulations included for new developments that requires trees to be planted around the outsides and taken care of so that Nelson doesn't become a concrete jungle.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S563.010	Meagan O'Brien	Residential Zones	Oppose	Require new buildings to be aesthetically pleasing.	I am concerned that I will be looking out at an ugly building rather than the view of the grampians that we have currently (a sense of space and being able to see nature is really important to me for my mental wellbeing, that's why we chose our house). {Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S565.002	James McPhie	Residential Zones	Amend	Give allowance for the necessary space for recreational area given the increased residents in the area.	Whilst in a different location in the last week I was taken with the rebuild and the planning of streets and access to public green space. It felt good as a pedestrian with ample space to relax / as a worker with ample of green (grass) space to gain fresh air breaks from work.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S568.007	Seamus O'Brien	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S568.008	Seamus O'Brien	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S568.007.	Accept	*Section 6*

S568.009	Seamus O'Brien	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S568.012	Seamus O'Brien	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S568.014	Seamus O'Brien	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S568.028	Seamus O'Brien	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S568.027.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S569.001	Mark Sutherland	Residential Zones	Amend	Insertion of rules to protect the amenity of an existing standard density property by way of requiring adherence to the lower density rules along a common boundary, while retaining the ability to increase density at an organic rate over time.	Tasman District Council rules for intensive development work very well for all parties in that they allow higher density development of a site, but where that site shares a boundary with another property which has not been developed under the high density rules then one must comply with the lower density restrictions along the common boundary. (Refer Tasman Resource Management Plan 17.1.3 (fd). This approach to intensification allows for an increase in density over time, at an organic pace and as the market demands, while retaining the amenity for any existing, adjacent, property owners. This approach, utilised in the Richmond Intensive Development Area, would appear to be a fairer and more equitable approach to intensification for the existing property owners of Nelson, than the current proposed plan change 29 which puts all and every property owner within Medium and High Density zones at risk of losing their amenity. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S572.002	Nelson Tasman Housing Trust	Residential Zones	Support in part	Make provision for buiding more, smaller homes.	Nelson's population is projected to increase in coming years, and there must be provision for building more smaller homes.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS56.078	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support	Accept	Providing greater housing choice is key to delivering a well-functioning future for Nelson, and that this can be achieved by enabling a higher density of development and thus greater range of housing typologies as provided for in PC29.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS38.012	Small Time Developments		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support in part are: Make provision for building more, smaller homes. Agree with the intent of this submission to encourage infill in a less intrusive manner, but perhaps the change to 3 dwellings will address this. Not every site will be developed intensively so the granny flat option will be available under this new rule.	Accept	*Section 6*
S573.008	David Allan	Residential Zones	Support	Enable up to 3 residential units per site (property) in all Residential zones (GRZ, MDZ & HDZ).	I strongly support the intent to intensify our existing residential areas by enabling up to 3 residential units per site (property) in all Residential zones (GRZ, MDZ & HDZ).	Accept	*Section 6*
S576.007	Dominic Alford	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S576.008	Dominic Alford	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S576.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S576.009	Dominic Alford	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S576.012	Dominic Alford	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S576.014	Dominic Alford	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 2 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S576.028	Dominic Alford	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S576.027.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S577.007	Adrienne Alford	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S577.008	Adrienne Alford	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S577.007.	Accept	*Section 6*

S577.009	Adrienne Alford	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S577.012	Adrienne Alford	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S577.014	Adrienne Alford	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 2 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S577.028	Adrienne Alford	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S577.027.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S578.010	Benjamin Plows-Kolff	Residential Zones	Support	Support allowing tiny houses in the General Residential Zone.	GRZ would allow for tiny houses and granny flats without the need for resource consent or costly expenses while also ensuring rates are paid for these dwellings. There are so many illegal dwellings and dodgy instalments in the region that council is unaware of; get rid of the cost and red tape to make these dwellings legitimate and get them on council's radar -they are a cost-effective solution to our housing woes. Furthermore, putting a tiny home on a road-legal trailer, only to have it sit in one spot just to get around laws is expensive and wasteful, implementing the GRZ will put an end to this wasteful practice.	Accept	*Section 6*
S578.011	Benjamin Plows-Kolff	Residential Zones	Support	Support allowing granny flats in the General Residential Zone.	Refer to reasons in submission point S578.010.	Accept	*Section 6*

FS38.013	Small Time Developments		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support in part are: Support allowing granny flats in the General Residential Zone. Agree with the intent of this submission to encourage infill in a less intrusive manner, but perhaps the change to 3 dwellings will address this. Not every site will be developed intensively so the granny flat option will be available under this new rule.	Accept	*Section 6*
S578.012	Benjamin Plows-Kolff	Residential Zones	Amend	[Encourage] secondary minor dwellings or granny flats.	Refer to reasons in submission point S578.010.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS28.139	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: [Encourage] secondary minor dwellings or granny flats. A tiny home or granny flat comprises an individual residential unit and would provide for potentially inappropriate residential intensification if allowed as a permitted activity on properties with an existing residential unit. There are a number of areas that are not appropriate for further residential intensification in particular those areas subject to the Nelson Airport Overlays and it is important that these areas are not further intensified with sensitive activities.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS38.014	Small Time Developments		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support in part are: [Encourage] secondary minor dwellings or granny flats. Agree with the intent of this submission to encourage infill in a less intrusive manner, but perhaps the change to 3 dwellings will address this. Not every site will be developed intensively so the granny flat option will be available under this new rule.	Accept	*Section 6*
S578.013	Benjamin Plows-Kolff	Residential Zones	Amend	Change in how rates are charged to ensure everyone pays their fair share when they have these kinds of buildings [granny flats and secondary minor dwellings] in use.	Refer to reasons in submission point S578.010.	Reject	*Section 6*
S578.025	Benjamin Plows-Kolff	Residential Zones	Support in part	Support building up to 4 storeys high with the possibility of basement level in areas not prone to flooding.	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

S579.001	Dee Taylor	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S579.002	Dee Taylor	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S579.003	Dee Taylor	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S579.015	Dee Taylor	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend rules to] increase permitted site coverage up to 70%, and build additional accommodation, providing daylight angles are met and car parking is provided.	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S579.016	Dee Taylor	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Restrict new multi-storey development to 3 storeys].	Any new multi-storey development should not exceed 3 storeys in a small town with Nelson's character.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S579.017	Dee Taylor	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Seeks that] any new developments of any kind or size should always be subject to resource consent and conform to daylight angles on adjacent residential properties.	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S580.006	Small Time Developments	Residential Zones	Support	Support recognising diversity of housing as an objective.	Not stated. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	*Section 6*
S580.008	Small Time Developments	Residential Zones	Support	Support 3 dwellings per site being a permitted activity in all new residential zones (REr.17B, REr.18B & REr.19B)	Not stated. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	*Section 6*
S580.009	Small Time Developments	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Oppose reference to "the attractiveness of the street" as being a matter that discretion is restricted to in REr.17B.3, REr.18B.3 &	Not stated. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS56.081	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support	Accept	Kāinga Ora agrees this matter of discretion is unclear and open to interpretation and would prefer a more specific matter of discretion to provide better clarity for plan users and decision makers.	Reject	*Section 6*

S580.011	Small Time Developments	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Oppose the definition of permeable landscaped area.	The definition of permeable landscape is problematic as it does not adequately define what is permeable and how it will be protected in the longer term. The issues are: "sealed does not equal impermeable" as there are many products already on the market that would fulfil both definitions in the common understanding. A "permeable" surface should have an initial constructed flow rate of greater than 500mm/hr or 5L/m2/hr. As a comparison, lawn surfaces are reported to have an average permeability of around 100mm/hr.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS56.083	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support	Accept	Kāinga Ora would also support greater flexibility through a revised definition which recognises there are products that provide a high level of permeability comparable to or better than planted areas. Consent conditions could be imposed to ensure permeable products continue to function as intended.	Reject	*Section 6*
S580.012	Small Time Developments	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Protect the 20% landscaped areas with stricter/clearer requirements [Amend REr.17H, REr.18H & REr.19H].	To maintain permeability, these landscaped areas need to be protected from vehicle traffic that kills vegetation, and/or compacts soil reducing permeability. Also, over time, non-consented developments can eat into the landscaped areas. Therefore, to practically achieve long term protection, a Consent Notice is proposed to show the permeable landscaped area(s) on title. If the intent is extended to require 20% garden areas to support biodiversity, reduction in heat island effect, visual amenity etc then stricter/clearer requirements are required.	Reject	*Section 6*
S580.013	Small Time Developments	Mapping	Oppose in part	Include a GIS layer showing the protected vegetative areas, using regular image capture and comparison of current surfaces [inferred to enable enforcement of REr.17H, REr.18H & REr.19H, see submission point 12].	Practically speaking NCC would need a GIS layer that included the protected vegetative areas, regular image capture and comparison of current surfaces. I believe that this can mostly be automated these days.	Reject	*Section 6*

S580.016	Small Time Developments	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Oppose the omission of a specific definition for Relocated Buildings.	The current rules appear to exclude new off- site builds greater than 30m2. If the Council is serious about facilitating infill housing and intensification then removing the restrictions on new off-site builds would be a step in the right direction.	Reject	*Section 6*
S580.017	Small Time Developments	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Oppose requiring resource consent (REr.33) for new off-site relocatable buildings over 30m2.	The explanation for requiring a resource consent for a controlled activity clearly uses words to describe the "re-use" of a resource. However, new off-site builds are being subject to this rule which is restrictive for infill housing. In addition there is potential conflict in the interaction of the proposed minimum house size rule in the MRZ and HRZ [Medium Density and High Density Residential Zone] and the existing 30m2 rules that does not require a resource consent (RC) for a transportable house (REr.33). By forcing a minimum 1 bedroom unit size of 35m2 it therefore makes it impossible to avoid a RC. Thus currently a 29.5m2, one bedroom unit could be placed on an existing title [in one of the existing residential zones] without a RC but that would not be possible under the new rules in the MRZ or HRZ. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S580.021	Small Time Developments	Residential Zones	Amend	Provide objectives, policies and rules [similar to Papakainga] that encourage collective housing in all residential zones.	The concept of papakainga is similar to that of collective housing, and in times of housing crisis, as we are currently experiencing, we believe that the NRMP should be providing similar objectives, policies and rules that encourage collective housing in all residential zones. There are many people in the Nelson/Tasman area with experience to assist in the writing of such objectives, policies and rules to facilitate smaller, quick-build, off-site affordable housing that will reduce the number of homeless in our region and meet the need for alternative living and housing styles that are not currently being catered for.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S580.022	Small Time Developments	Residential Zones	Support in part	Include recognition of collective housing as a viable development option in DO13A.4.1.e.	We support the addition of DO13A.4.1.e but believe that this policy should go further to include recognition of collective housing as a viable development option. Based on the intention of the previous two statements (DO13A.4.1.d and c), collective housing is still restricted by some of the rules in residential zones.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S580.026	Small Time Developments	Residential Zones	Support in part	Support the amendment of DO14.1 city layout and design to recognise an increase in housing choice as part of a well-functioning urban environment.	Not stated. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	*Section 6*
S580.027	Small Time Developments	Residential Zones	Support in part	Support the amendment of DO14.2 amenity values to include a recognition that amenity is more than just attractiveness, and includes diversity of housing.	Support the amendment of DO14.2 amenity values to include a recognition that amenity is more than just attractiveness, and includes diversity of housing, so that more people can live in safe, warm houses of a size and design that meets their needs, rather than the expectations of others. While this objective attempts to address the changes that will occur to streetscapes with increased building height and density, there are other rules that still limit the provision of housing choice, due to restrictions on building sizes, addressed further in the submission.	Accept	*Section 6*
S580.028	Small Time Developments	Residential Zones	Support	Support the rewording of policy DO15.1.1.	Policy DO15.1.1 supports increase in density and recognises that diversity of housing contributes to a well-functioning urban environment.	Accept	*Section 6*
S580.029	Small Time Developments	Residential Zones	Support	Support the wording of the zone statements in DO161.1.iii and DO161.1.iv to describe the general planned built character of the zones and a recognition that the addition of these zones will result in a moderate to high degree of visual change to neighbourhoods.	We agree that this change in the "look" of neighbourhoods is necessary in order to meet the diverse and pressing housing needs of our city and reflect the fact that there is a demand for smaller house sizes and a variety of on and off-site designs and materials that may look different to existing, established areas. Amenity means more than just visually pleasing, which is a subjective in nature.	Accept	*Section 6*

S580.030	Small Time Developments	Residential Zones	Support	Support the addition of REd.9 and REd.10 introducing the new residential zones and acknowledging that the appearance and character of neighbourhoods will change as a result of these new zones, in order to meet the	We recognise that some areas of the city are less suited to more intensive development due to natural hazard risks and sea level rise.	Accept	*Section 6*
S580.031	Small Time Developments	Residential Zones	Support in part	Extend RE1.7, RE1.8, RE2.9. to include specific reference to collective housing as an intensive and diverse form of housing development.	We support the intent of these new policies but suggest that they could be extended to include specific reference to collective housing as an intensive and diverse form of housing development.	Accept	*Section 6*
S581.002	Hilary Kirby	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the new residential zones - specifically the height increases of 8m, 11m and 19.5m in existing residential areas and in particular Stoke and Tahunanui Hill areas, and the proposed new recession planes, site coverages, and yard setbacks.	The impact of multiple 2,3 and 6 story development on existing sections [in Stoke] will change the heart of the community and put strain on already at capacity and limited community resources, shops and services. It will visually alter the open and sunny environment, and the intensified expected population from these dwellings will change the community environment and safety in our central Stoke shopping area. This will put strain on roading infrastructure, schooling, public services, and change the lifestyle for many residents who choose to live here. [Refer to page 2 in the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	*Section 6*

FS61.053	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- The impact of multiple 2,3 and 6 story development on existing sections [in Stoke] will change the heart of the community and put strain on already at capacity and limited community resources, shops and services. It will visually alter the open and sunny environment, and the intensified expected population from these dwellings will change the community environment and safety in our central Stoke shopping area. This will put strain on roading infrastructure, schooling, public services, and change the lifestyle for many residents who choose to live here. Oppose the new residential zones - specifically the height increases of 8m, 11m and 19.5m in existing residential areas and in particular Stoke and Tahunanui Hill areas, and the proposed new recession planes, site coverages, and yard setbacks. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- No need for any HDZ in Stoke and Tahunanui hill areas, these are small suburbs in a small smart little city, Nelson city should be where HDZ is concentrated as has the infrastructure to support unlike Stoke/Tahunanui.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

FS72.057	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- The impact of multiple 2,3 and 6 story development on existing sections [in Stoke] will change the heart of the community and put strain on already at capacity and limited community resources, shops and services. It will visually alter the open and sunny environment, and the intensified expected population from these dwellings will change the community environment and safety in our central Stoke shopping area. This will put strain on roading infrastructure, schooling, public services, and change the lifestyle for many residents who choose to live here. Oppose the new residential zones - specifically the height increases of 8m, 11m and 19.5m in existing residential areas and in particular Stoke and Tahunanui Hill areas, and the proposed new recession planes, site coverages, and yard setbacks. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- No need for any HDZ in Stoke and Tahunanui hill areas, these are small suburbs in a small smart little city, Nelson city should be where HDZ is concentrated as has the infrastructure to support unlike Stoke/Tahunanui.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

FS60.049	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- The impact of multiple 2,3 and 6 story development on existing sections [in Stoke] will change the heart of the community and put strain on already at capacity and limited community resources, shops and services. It will visually alter the open and sunny environment, and the intensified expected population from these dwellings will change the community environment and safety in our central Stoke shopping area. This will put strain on roading infrastructure, schooling, public services, and change the lifestyle for many residents who choose to live here. Oppose the new residential zones - specifically the height increases of 8m, 11m and 19.5m in existing residential areas and in particular Stoke and Tahunanui Hill areas, and the proposed new recession planes, site coverages, and yard setbacks. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- No need for any HDZ in Stoke and Tahunanui hill areas, these are small suburbs in a small smart little city, Nelson city should be where HDZ is concentrated as has the infrastructure to support unlike Stoke/Tahunanui.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S581.003	Hilary Kirby	Residential Zones	Amend	Proposes altering residential zones to allow 2 or 3 story developments in new subdivisions only, within the Nelsonand Stoke residential areas. In these areas, propose proper design guidelines, reduced site coverage, large green spaces, cycle ways, retained trees, public transport and schools. Ensure that these new subdivision areas are created and developed as a community.	Those that want to live in multi story low maintenance housing are catered for, but those that prefer to have some space/sun/privacy around them are also respected, acknowledged and able to maintain the environment they currently have. Propose that proper design guidelines are incorporated into these new multi-story residential areas -- and that site coverage is reduced, large green spaces required, cycle ways are incorporated to allow residents to be outdoors and active. Propose trees are retained, planted and maintained, and public transport readily available directly to these new sub division areas. Propose that schooling is thought of and planned for in these areas too. [Refer to pages 2 and 3 in the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S581.009	Hilary Kirby	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings be built on all new green field developments.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S583.001	Janet Matheson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S583.002	Janet Matheson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S583.003	Janet Matheson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S583.010	Janet Matheson	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Maximum 3 storeys. Preferably 2 storeys.	3 storeys will wedge people in leaving them with no light.	Reject	*Section 6*

S583.011	Janet Matheson	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Maintain existing NRMP daylight admission rules [inferred].	Consideration of existing light and sun angles to be taken into consideration. Refer to reasons in submission point S583.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S585.006	Rosemary Cooke	Residential Zones	Oppose	Retain the resource consent requirements and processes from the NRMP [inferred].	The need for Resource consent is an important part of the democratic process that enables nearby residents to inform the council and developers of implications for the local community of proposed development that they may not be aware of.	Reject	*Section 6*
S586.001	Michael McCarthy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Remove the definition that a vehicle is not a building whether it is used as short- or long-term accommodation.	In the Residential, Inner City, Suburban Commercial and Industrial zones, a building includes a vehicle or motor vehicle (including a vehicle or motor vehicle as defined in section 2(1) of the Land Transport Act 1998) that is immovable and is occupied by people on a permanent or long term basis. The definition change quoted above is wrong and is an infringement of people's right to reasonable and affordable housing, it appears to be preparation for another cash grab and in my view constitutes a breach of human rights. This is not the New Zealand I want for my children. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S587.003	Change PC 29 Incorporated	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the inclusion of recession planes (in any Residential Zone) which commence at a height or angle greater than provided in the current Nelson Resource Management Plan.	I (and my non-corporate Members) bought my home in an area where I knew that there was existing legal protection of residential amenities (in particular as to height and sunlight); and I reasonably expected that to continue.	Reject	*Section 6*
S587.004	Change PC 29 Incorporated	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose all and any maximum height (in any Residential Zone) in excess of 10 metres.	The justification for the high starting point for recession angles, and the degree of such angles (as set out in the Section 32 Report) becomes irrelevant if the maximum height is 10 metres (or lower). A height of 10 metres allows for two storey houses/apartments - or three storey if designed with expertise.	Reject	*Section 6*
S587.005	Change PC 29 Incorporated	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the inclusion of "restricted discretionary" [activity status for resource consents] in the PC 29 in relation to any	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

S587.009	Change PC 29 Incorporated	Residential Zones	Oppose	Request amendments throughout the proposed Plan Change to ensure that the expression "the ability to achieve the planned built character of the zone" (and similar expressions) are removed, if the Plan Change is to proceed in any form.	Oppose the inclusion in the Rules of all provisions that mean that the "planned built character of the zone" is more important than (and therefore trumps) the negative effect which a proposed building and/or development would have on adjoining sites.	Reject	*Section 6*
S589.020	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Residential Zones	Support	Further clarification needed as to the application of these assessment criteria in REr.17B.4, to each activity type under rule REr.17B.	Fire and Emergency strongly support the inclusion of the following matters within the assessment criteria: • whether the development can be adequately serviced for firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of Practice. • whether access for emergency service vehicles is appropriately designed so that staff can access the site safely and efficiently However, it is unclear when the assessment criteria is applied and clarification regarding this is required.	Reject	*Section 6*
S589.021	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend REr.17l Fences as follows: REr.17l.1 A fence is a permitted activity provided that: ...***x.*** *it does not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut off valves, or other emergency response facilities.*	Fire and Emergency support REr.17l insofar as (a) requires fencing to not block access to any parking or manoeuvring space. It is important to Fire and Emergency that the erection of fences and walls will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut off valves, or other emergency response facilities. Fences and walls should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for Fire and Emergency. As such, Fire and Emergency seeks an amendment to provide for this.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS68.009	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Amend REr.17l Fences as follows: A fence is a permitted activity provided that: ... x. it does not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut off valves, or other emergency response facilities. The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in this plan change.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS69.013	Ryman Healthcare Limited		Oppose in part	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Amend REr.17l Fences as follows: A fence is a permitted activity provided that: ... x. it does not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut off valves, or other emergency response facilities. Ryman opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in this plan change.	Reject	*Section 6*
S589.028	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Residential Zones	Support	Retain RE1.1 as drafted.	Fire and Emergency support RE1.1 insofar as it promotes the provision of a variety of building densities (such as higher densities) providing the existing / planned capacity of the infrastructure has been taken into account.	Accept	*Section 6*
S589.029	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Residential Zones	Support	Retain RE2.8 Community Benefit as drafted.	Fire and Emergency support RE2.8 as it recognises that non-residential activities, such as emergency service facilities, may need to locate in the residential zones for the benefit of the community. Furthermore, REr.8.j specifically references that emergency service facilities may increase the amenity and service to the community.	Accept	*Section 6*

S589.031	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Further clarification needed as to the application of rule REr.17B.1 and REr.17B.3, and relevance of assessment criteria to each activity status.	Fire and Emergency support REr.17B providing the assessment criteria listed in REr.17B.4 is applicable to all activity types under this rule. If the assessment criteria is not applicable to all activity types, there is a risk that when developing up to three residential units on a site, emergency service access and firefighting water supply matters will not be appropriately provided for.	Reject	*Section 6*
S591.008	Kent Inglis	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Amend the building setback rules to allow exemptions where the neighbouring property has existing buildings built to the shared boundary [inferred].	Refer to the reasons in submission point S591.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
S591.009	Kent Inglis	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Amend the outdoor living court (OLC) requirements for residential units in all zones. Apply a consistent approach requiring the net area of the OLC to be minimum percentage (i.e. 15%) of the dwelling floor area, while requiring a minimum dimension (i.e. not less than 2m at one point and 8m overall); and allowing multiple	Refer to reasons in submission point S591.004.	Reject	*Section 6*
S595.002	Graeme OBrien	Residential Zones	Oppose	Retain the current daylight angles from the NRMP [inferred].	I object to the changes in the daylight angle.	Reject	*Section 6*
S595.004	Graeme OBrien	Residential Zones	Oppose	Restrict the maximum building height to two storeys in residential areas [inferred].	I object to the intensification of over 2 story buildings in residential areas.	Reject	*Section 6*
S595.008	Graeme OBrien	Residential Zones	Support	Enable infill housing through subdividing, cross leasing, granny flats by amending the rules to allow smaller lot sizes and increased site coverage [inferred].	I support any changes that would encourage infill housing type developments, subdividing, Cross leasing granny flats etc such as smaller lot sizes, and bigger coverage of that section of 2 story or less buildings.	Accept	*Section 6*

S597.004	Stephanie Phillips	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Oppose the non notification clauses for resource consents for multi unit residential developments [inferred].	Loss of rights under the RMA to be consulted, to have value in your primary asset protected and rights to object under existing law. These rights have been gifted to developers, stolen without compensation and for no reasonable gain for the city. A six storey building would require Resource Consent for more than 3 dwellings. Under the existing law for a Resource Consent Application the assessment criteria "Effect is less than minor" the biggest effect to the adjacent residences is this planning change and the loss of the right to object to the bulk and location of a commercial scale building 1m away from your home. Therefore the ability to argue against the building containing 6 or 12 dwellings - would be difficult as there would be no additional effect with more residents.	Reject	*Section 6*
S597.009	Stephanie Phillips	Residential Zones	Support in part	Allow up to three residential units on a site.	Allowing up to 3 dwellings on a site would allow for small infill houses and partitioning, turning a large house into a couple of dwellings. This would significantly and quickly allow for population growth in the city fringe and protect larger character homes as they could be split into several apartments.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS38.015	Small Time Developments		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: Allow up to three residential units on a site. The 3 dwellings rule is a key one for opening opportunities for affordable housing. Agree that small infill housing and partitioning of existing houses would cater quickly for population increase and protect larger character homes.	Accept	*Section 6*
S597.010	Stephanie Phillips	Residential Zones	Support in part	Support the 8m maximum building height in the General Residential Zone [inferred].	8m high allows for 2.1/2 storeys - gives a dynamic gabled street frontage with variation of form.	Accept	*Section 6*
S597.011	Stephanie Phillips	Residential Zones	Amend	Increase the maximum site coverage to 50% in the General Residential zone where 25% of the site is permeable surface	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S597.012	Stephanie Phillips	Residential Zones	Support in part	Support the proposed front yard rule for the General Residential Zone [inferred].	Not stated.	Accept	*Section 6*

S597.013	Stephanie Phillips	Residential Zones	Support in part	Support the proposed other yards rule for the side and rear property boundaries in the General Residential Zone [inferred]	Not stated.	Accept	*Section 6*
S597.018	Stephanie Phillips	Residential Zones	Amend	Use a discretionary rule framework to encourage preferred development behavior such as zero carbon, timber multi storey construction, diverse ownership models, with full public notification precluded where these conditions are met.	Other cities before us have faced this dilemma. They have leveraged carrot and stick with discretionary rules held by council to encourage preferred behavior. We are letting go of this power. We could encourage: - zero carbon. - Timber multi storey construction of which we have world leading expertise within the city - Diverse ownership models, rental, Kainga Ora, affordable, high end, short term tenancy, artist in residence. Discretionary Resource consent is seen within design professionals as a pathway to success. It is not a full Notified Consent, so has the advantage of success while a set of parameters to meet. It is critical to keep Resource Consent - Discretionary process to enable prohibition and encouragement of desired outcomes.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S597.022	Stephanie Phillips	Residential Zones	Amend	Once the Inner City Zone has a population of at least 2000 residents, enable and incentivise higher density comprehensive development of suitably sized and located sites within existing residential areas, through an Enhanced development mechanism (EDM) and restricted discretionary resource consent process as per section 14.13 of the Christchurch District Plan. Development can change to medium density using the EDM if they meet the following criteria: Minimum 1500m2 continuous area Density of 30-65 dwellings per hectare Maximum building height of 11m with 8m building height on boundaries external to the site 4.5m road setback and garages set back an additional 1.2m from road facing building frontages 1.8m setback from boundaries external to the site Daylight recession planes for internal boundaries Minimum unit sizes based on number of bedrooms Outdoor living space requirements relative to size of unit and number of storeys 1 car park and 1 cycle parking space per unit 40% site coverage by buildings outdoor service spaces for washing lines adn rubbish bins landscaping and tree planting provisions acoustic insulation for some types of roads. Developments that comply with this criteria can be processed without the requirement for limited or public notification.	Christchurch medium density rule [Refer to Section 14.13 of the Christchurch District Plan]. Any general Residential site can change to medium if they meet certain criteria - Min 1500 m2 (amalgamate 2 or more sites) - Go to density of 30 - 65 dwellings / hectare from existing 10 - 15 dwellings. - NCC existing residential ratio is 13 / hectare new General zone will be 50 / hectare. Large sites provide the flexibility to design medium density housing in a way that fits in with the surrounding area. The space available can be used to vary the design and pattern of buildings on the site and to incorporate useful and attractive open areas. Taller buildings (up to 11 metres high) must be located away from boundaries so they do not shade or overlook neighbours. Rules that comply with all criteria can be processed without the requirement for limited or public notification. [Standards included in the original submission are:] - Maximum height of 11m (three storey) except within 15m of a Residential Suburban zone boundary where the height is limited to 8m (two storey). - 4.5m road setback unless otherwise stated, and garages and carports must be located at least 1.2m behind the front façade of the unit for residential units fronting the road. - 1.8m setback from neighbouring properties unless otherwise stated. - Recession Planes from internal boundaries. - Minimum unit sizes of between 35m2 (studio) and 90m2 (3 or more bedrooms) and a requirement for a mix of unit sizes where 6 or more units are proposed. - Ground floor habitable space requirements Outdoor living space requirements include: Units with 2 or more bedroom units - 30m2 per unit, with 16m2 being private and accessible. Ground floor 1 bedroom units - 16m2 per unit, minimum dimension of 4m, all private and accessible. Upper floor 1 bedroom units - 16m2 per unit, with 6m2 with a minimum dimension of 1.5m being private and accessible. - 1 car park per unit, and 1 cycle space per unit (unless the car park is provided in a	Reject	*Section 6*

FS61.088	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support in part	Accept in part	The Particular Part of the submission I support in part/:- If we extended the city intensification (max 4 storeys) zone up Vanguard, existing commercial zoned sites. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support in part:- Agree inner city and fringes can go up to 4 storeys, not sure about Tahunanui and Stoke residential areas.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS72.092	Jude Osborne		Support in part	Accept in part	The Particular Part of the submission I support in part/:- If we extended the city intensification (max 4 storeys) zone up Vanguard, existing commercial zoned sites Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support in part:- Agree inner city and fringes can go up to 4 storeys, not sure about Tahunanui and Stoke residential areas.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS60.084	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support in part	Accept in part	The Particular Part of the submission I support in part/:- If we extended the city intensification (max 4 storeys) zone up Vanguard, existing commercial zoned sites. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support in part:- Agree inner city and fringes can go up to 4 storeys, not sure about Tahunanui and Stoke residential areas.	Reject	*Section 6*
S598.002	David Rees	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Request a maximum [height] of three stories in all residential areas.	Regarding necessity, the population growth of Nelson city over the next ten years is projected to be 3,500. That's 350 per year. This equates to 105 new dwellings based on accepted modelling. This level of growth should not need the drastic intensification which is proposed in PC29. Surely it could be accommodated by more high-rise in the CBD coupled with 2 or 3 storey town house, terraced style buildings in general residential areas outside the CBD.	Reject	*Section 6*
S598.003	David Rees	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Request that] any buildings higher than their surroundings be subject to reasonable constraints with regards to stealing light and	PC29 should not remove these constraints.	Reject	*Section 6*

S601.001	Julie Strange	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Require individual consultation with the neighbourhood in order to build a 2 or 3 or 6 storied building in residential zones in Nelson.	All plans should be looked at one by one, no property developer should expect a 2,3 or 6-storied building to be planned and go ahead without neighbours having a say in the process. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S602.004	Andrew Ng	Residential Zones	Amend	Maintain or at worst, relax daylight angles slightly and no so dramatically.	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S603.005	SPArchitect Ltd	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Oppose the non notification clauses for resource consents for multi unit residential developments [inferred].	Loss of rights under the RMA to be consulted, to have value in your primary asset protected and rights to object under existing law. These rights have been gifted to developers, stolen without compensation and for no reasonable gain for the city. A six storey building would require Resource Consent for more than 3 dwellings. Under the existing law for a Resource Consent Application the assessment criteria "Effect is less than minor" the biggest effect to the adjacent residences is this planning change and the loss of the right to object to the bulk and location of a commercial scale building 1m away from your home. Therefore the ability to argue against the building containing 6 or 12 dwellings - would be difficult as there would be no additional effect with more residents.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS38.016	Small Time Developments		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Oppose the non notification clauses for resource consents for multi unit residential developments [inferred]. This ties up the system and creates unnecessary extra expense. Each proposal should be judged on its merits.	Accept	*Section 6*
S603.009	SPArchitect Ltd	Residential Zones	Support in part	Support the proposed General Residential Zone and rule framework for that zone [inferred].	Planning changes in the general zone are great. It will allow for intensification that is diverse and cost effective.	Accept	*Section 6*

S603.010	SPArchitect Ltd	Residential Zones	Support in part	Allow up to three residential units on a site.	Allowing up to 3 dwellings on a site would allow for small infill houses and partitioning, turning a large house into a couple of dwellings. This would significantly and quickly allow for population growth in the city fringe and protect larger character homes as they could be split into several apartments.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS38.017	Small Time Developments		Oppose	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: Allow up to three residential units on a site. The 3 dwellings rule is a key one for opening opportunities for affordable housing.	Accept	*Section 6*
S603.011	SPArchitect Ltd	Residential Zones	Support in part	Support the 8m maximum building height in the General Residential Zone [inferred].	8m high allows for 2.1/2 storeys - gives a dynamic gabled street frontage with variation of form.	Accept	*Section 6*
S603.012	SPArchitect Ltd	Residential Zones	Amend	Increase the maximum site coverage to 50% in the General Residential zone where 25% of the site is permeable surface	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S603.013	SPArchitect Ltd	Residential Zones	Support in part	Support the proposed front yard rule for the General Residential Zone [inferred].	Not stated.	Accept	*Section 6*
S603.014	SPArchitect Ltd	Residential Zones	Support in part	Support the proposed other yards rule for the side and rear property boundaries in the General Residential Zone [inferred]	Not stated.	Accept	*Section 6*
S603.019	SPArchitect Ltd	Residential Zones	Amend	Use a discretionary rule framework to encourage preferred development behavior such as zero carbon, timber multi storey construction, diverse ownership models, with full public notification precluded where these conditions are met.	Other cities before us have faced this dilemma. They have leveraged carrot and stick with discretionary rules held by council to encourage preferred behavior. We are letting go of this power. We could encourage: - zero carbon. - Timber multi storey construction of which we have world leading expertise within the city - Diverse ownership models, rental, Kainga Ora, affordable, high end, short term tenancy, artist in residence. Discretionary Resource consent is seen within design professionals as a pathway to success. It is not a full Notified Consent, so has the advantage of success while a set of parameters to meet. It is critical to keep Resource Consent - Discretionary process to enable prohibition and encouragement of desired outcomes.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S603.023	SPArchitect Ltd	Residential Zones	Amend	Once the Inner City Zone has a population of at least 2000 residents, enable and incentivise higher density comprehensive development of suitably sized and located sites within existing residential areas, through an Enhanced development mechanism (EDM) and restricted discretionary resource consent process as per section 14.13 of the Christchurch District Plan. Development can change to medium density using the EDM if they meet the following criteria: Minimum 1500m2 continuous area Density of 30-65 dwellings per hectare Maximum building height of 11m with 8m building height on boundaries external to the site 4.5m road setback and garages set back an additional 1.2m from road facing building frontages 1.8m setback from boundaries external to the site Daylight recession planes for internal boundaries Minimum unit sizes based on number of bedrooms Outdoor living space requirements relative to size of unit and number of storeys 1 car park and 1 cycle parking space per unit 40% site coverage by buildings outdoor service spaces for washing lines adn rubbish bins landscaping and tree planting provisions acoustic insulation for some types of roads. Developments that comply with this criteria can be processed without the requirement for limited or public notification.	Christchurch medium density rule [Refer to Section 14.13 of the Christchurch District Plan]. Any general Residential site can change to medium if they meet certain criteria - Min 1500 m2 (amalgamate 2 or more sites) - Go to density of 30 - 65 dwellings / hectare from existing 10 - 15 dwellings. - NCC existing residential ratio is 13 / hectare new General zone will be 50 / hectare. Large sites provide the flexibility to design medium density housing in a way that fits in with the surrounding area. The space available can be used to vary the design and pattern of buildings on the site and to incorporate useful and attractive open areas. Taller buildings (up to 11 metres high) must be located away from boundaries so they do not shade or overlook neighbours. Rules that comply with all criteria can be processed without the requirement for limited or public notification. [Standards included in the original submission are:] - Maximum height of 11m (three storey) except within 15m of a Residential Suburban zone boundary where the height is limited to 8m (two storey). - 4.5m road setback unless otherwise stated, and garages and carports must be located at least 1.2m behind the front façade of the unit for residential units fronting the road. - 1.8m setback from neighbouring properties unless otherwise stated. - Recession Planes from internal boundaries. - Minimum unit sizes of between 35m2 (studio) and 90m2 (3 or more bedrooms) and a requirement for a mix of unit sizes where 6 or more units are proposed. - Ground floor habitable space requirements Outdoor living space requirements include: Units with 2 or more bedroom units - 30m2 per unit, with 16m2 being private and accessible. Ground floor 1 bedroom units - 16m2 per unit, minimum dimension of 4m, all private and accessible. Upper floor 1 bedroom units - 16m2 per unit, with 6m2 with a minimum dimension of 1.5m being private and accessible. - 1 car park per unit, and 1 cycle space per unit (unless the car park is provided in a	Reject	*Section 6*

S605.002	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Insert] new definition for Character Area Overlay [as follows]:means groupings of interrelated, but not necessarily contiguous items, places or features (including view shafts) that collectively reflect neighbourhood character. Character Area may include both contributing and non-contributing items, places or features.	Plan Change 29 ('PC29') forms a fundamental change to existing housing typologies within the Nelson District. Nelson City exhibits many characteristics and values that have not been adequately considered within the PC29 notification documents. The Nelson City Council ('Council') have notified PC29 under the guise that they are mandated by the National Policy Statement - Urban Development 2020 ('NPS-UD') to implement housing intensification standards. The NPS-UD acknowledges that not all urban areas are suitable for intensification due to specific features or characteristics which require protection or further consideration in any given location. PC29 misunderstands how the NPS-UD manages amenity values. While changes in amenity values "are not, of themselves, an adverse effect", they remain important considerations to whether PC29 achieves a well-functioning urban environment. Changes in amenity values are anticipated to occur over time, and intensification shall be integrated in a manner that has regard to receiving sensitivities. This may require spatial consolidation of intensification to ensure uptake does not occur in an ad-hoc manner. The notified documents are deficient in detailed assessment of the effects of implementing higher density housing, particularly in relation to amenity and character of the existing neighbourhoods. The Urban Design Report fails to recognise that this assessment will be different depending on specific locality. Without understanding the character and values of each neighbourhood, the proposed rezonings have not been adequately assessed and understood. [This submission is] oppos[ed to] the introduction of new strategic objectives and policies (and amendments to existing strategic objectives and policies) that prioritise housing intensification without recognising existing character and amenity values of surrounding neighbourhoods.	Reject	*Section 6 and Section 12 of the Overview report*

FS30.001	Kathleen Mardon		Support in part	Accept	The decision I seek is that the submission is accepted but that the specific area defined in that submission at Submission Table A is extended to that area on both sides of Collingwood Street between Bronte Street and Nile Street currently zoned low density residential (The Collingwood Street Area), and proposed to be High Density under proposed PC29. The reason for my support is that I agree with the area has special characteristics and the reason I seek extension of the Character Area to the Collingwood Street Area is it is contiguous with the Character Area in that submission and it too has special characteristics that warrant protection. Further I note that would be consistent with the treatment of neighbourhood N20- Fairfield Park- as has been used by Nelson City Council in its intensification planning from time to time; for example the FDS 2019.	Reject	*Section 6 and Section 12 of the Overview report*
FS39.013	Richard Harden and Rachel Reese		Support	Accept	This submission clearly articulates the deficiences in PC29 and the missed steps in its preparation. We support this submission in full and the planning principles and methods it is promoting.	Reject	*Section 6 and Section 12 of the Overview report*

FS36.001	Andrew Marriott		Support	Accept in part	The decision I seek is that submission is accepted but that the specific area defined in that submission at Submission Table A (the Character Area) is extended to that area on both sides of Collingwood Street between Bronte Street and Manuka Street currently zoned low density residential (The Collingwood Street Area). The reason for my support is that I agree the area has special characteristics and the reason I seek extension of the Character Area to the Collingwood Street Area is it is contiguous with the Character Area in that submission and it too has special characteristics that warrant protection. Further I note that would be consistent with the treatment of neighbourhood N20- Fairfield Park in regard to Collingwood Street from Manuka Street north- as has been used by Nelson City Council in its intensification planning from time to time; by way of example only the FDS 2019 assessments of availability and proposed neighbourhood planning.	Reject	*Section 6 and Section 12 of the Overview report*

FS64.002	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety. The decision I seek is that the submission is accepted but that the specific area defined in that submission at Submission Table A (the Character Area) is extended to that area on both sides of Collingwood Street between Bronte Street and Manuka Street currently zoned low density residential (the Collingwood Street Area). The reason for my support is that I agree the area has special characteristics that have not been considered sufficiently as a part of the plan change; and the reason I seek extension of the Character Area to the Collingwood Street Area is it is contiguous with the Character Area in submission 605 and it too has special characteristics that warrant protection. Further I note that would be consistent with the treatment of neighbourhood N20-Fairfield Park in regard to Collingwood Street from Manuka Street north - as has been used by Nelson City Council in its availability and proposed neighbourhood panning.	Reject	*Section 6 and Section 12 of the Overview report*

S605.005	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend] DO13A.1.1.1 Recognising the local context [as follows]: Subdivision and development should not perpetuate existing patterns of design and layout that are not valued development patterns, nor representative of the urban design outcomes sought progressively through the rolling review of the Plan. For example, subdivision layout can be considered in terms of how it contributes to valued development patterns such as the connectivity of roading networks, retention of valued topographical features, landscape and streetscape values, and the sustainable use of existing infrastructure. The assessment can also include road and allotment layout that enables building development to continue any valued built development patterns in the particular locality, ~~while also enabling development consistent with the planned built character of the zone~~. Site specific matters such as breach of crossing point maximums, front yard setbacks, fence heights, parking and manoeuvring area rules and standards will be considered in terms of how they contribute to enhanced urban design outcomes for the street	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS64.005	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety. The decision I seek is that the submission is accepted but that the specific area defined in that submission at Submission Table A (the Character Area) is extended to that area on both sides of Collingwood Street between Bronte Street and Manuka Street currently zoned low density residential (the Collingwood Street Area). The reason for my support is that I agree the area has special characteristics that have not been considered sufficiently as a part of the plan change; and the reason I seek extension of the Character Area to the Collingwood Street Area is it is contiguous with the Character Area in submission 605 and it too has special characteristics that warrant protection. Further I note that would be consistent with the treatment of neighbourhood N20-Fairfield Park in regard to Collingwood Street from Manuka Street north - as has been used by Nelson City Council in its availability and proposed neighbourhood panning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.006	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend] DO13A.4.1 flexibility, choices and adaptability [as follows]: Subdivision and development facilitate, where appropriate: a. mixed use developments that support a variety of compatible land uses and reflect local needs. b. flexibility to adapt buildings and spaces to accommodate a range of uses both now and in the future. c. a range of building types to provide accommodation and offer opportunities for all groups within the community. d. a range of subdivision layouts that contribute to a diversity of neighbourhood types and identities. e. developments ~~that enable as many people as possible to independently use and interact with the on site~~	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS64.006	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety. The decision I seek is that the submission is accepted but that the specific area defined in that submission at Submission Table A (the Character Area) is extended to that area on both sides of Collingwood Street between Bronte Street and Manuka Street currently zoned low density residential (the Collingwood Street Area). The reason for my support is that I agree the area has special characteristics that have not been considered sufficiently as a part of the plan change; and the reason I seek extension of the Character Area to the Collingwood Street Area is it is contiguous with the Character Area in submission 605 and it too has special characteristics that warrant protection. Further I note that would be consistent with the treatment of neighbourhood N20-Fairfield Park in regard to Collingwood Street from Manuka Street north - as has been used by Nelson City Council in its availability and proposed neighbourhood panning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.007	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend] DO18A.3.1 Environmentally responsive [as follows]: Subdivision and development should be environmentally responsive, which for the urban environment includes considering the following opportunities: ...m. the consideration of character and values of existing	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS64.007	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety. The decision I seek is that the submission is accepted but that the specific area defined in that submission at Submission Table A (the Character Area) is extended to that area on both sides of Collingwood Street between Bronte Street and Manuka Street currently zoned low density residential (the Collingwood Street Area). The reason for my support is that I agree the area has special characteristics that have not been considered sufficiently as a part of the plan change; and the reason I seek extension of the Character Area to the Collingwood Street Area is it is contiguous with the Character Area in submission 605 and it too has special characteristics that warrant protection. Further I note that would be consistent with the treatment of neighbourhood N20-Fairfield Park in regard to Collingwood Street from Manuka Street north - as has been used by Nelson City Council in its availability and proposed neighbourhood panning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.008	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[planning] DO 15.1.1 Environmental results anticipated and performance indicators [as follows]: Use of locally distinctive materials. Relation to the scale, location and alignments of valued existing development and neighbourhood character ~~where it is compatible with the planned builtcharacter of the zone.~~ Retention of topography and natural features	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS64.008	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety. The decision I seek is that the submission is accepted but that the specific area defined in that submission at Submission Table A (the Character Area) is extended to that area on both sides of Collingwood Street between Bronte Street and Manuka Street currently zoned low density residential (the Collingwood Street Area). The reason for my support is that I agree the area has special characteristics that have not been considered sufficiently as a part of the plan change; and the reason I seek extension of the Character Area to the Collingwood Street Area is it is contiguous with the Character Area in submission 605 and it too has special characteristics that warrant protection. Further I note that would be consistent with the treatment of neighbourhood N20-Fairfield Park in regard to Collingwood Street from Manuka Street north - as has been used by Nelson City Council in its availability and proposed neighbourhood panning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.009	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Subdivision	Oppose	follows]: Subdivision and development supports a well-functioning urban environment that recognises and is appropriate to the natural characteristics and values of the City, ~~increase housing choice,~~ and is consistent with principles of high quality urban design, and the orderly	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS64.010	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety. The decision I seek is that the submission is accepted but that the specific area defined in that submission at Submission Table A (the Character Area) is extended to that area on both sides of Collingwood Street between Bronte Street and Manuka Street currently zoned low density residential (the Collingwood Street Area). The reason for my support is that I agree the area has special characteristics that have not been considered sufficiently as a part of the plan change; and the reason I seek extension of the Character Area to the Collingwood Street Area is it is contiguous with the Character Area in submission 605 and it too has special characteristics that warrant protection. Further I note that would be consistent with the treatment of neighbourhood N20-Fairfield Park in regard to Collingwood Street from Manuka Street north - as has been used by Nelson City Council in its availability and proposed neighbourhood panning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.010	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Subdivision	Oppose	[Amend] DO14.1.2 type and intensity of development [as follows]: The type and intensity of subdivision and development should reflect the natural and physical capabilities of the land and the character	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS64.011	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety. The decision I seek is that the submission is accepted but that the specific area defined in that submission at Submission Table A (the Character Area) is extended to that area on both sides of Collingwood Street between Bronte Street and Manuka Street currently zoned low density residential (the Collingwood Street Area). The reason for my support is that I agree the area has special characteristics that have not been considered sufficiently as a part of the plan change; and the reason I seek extension of the Character Area to the Collingwood Street Area is it is contiguous with the Character Area in submission 605 and it too has special characteristics that warrant protection. Further I note that would be consistent with the treatment of neighbourhood N20-Fairfield Park in regard to Collingwood Street from Manuka Street north - as has been used by Nelson City Council in its availability and proposed neighbourhood panning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.011	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Subdivision	Oppose	[Amend] DO-P.New: Urban development [as follows]: All subdivisions need to be designed having regard to the overall pattern of present and future development in the locality, and the efficient use of the land resource, and provision and use of infrastructure. The efficient subdivision and development of land will be facilitated by requiring subdividers and developers to contribute towards the costs of providing services for new developments. Development of existing sites shall be designed with consideration of the impact on existing character and values of the surrounding environment, is a key way in which	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS64.012	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety. The decision I seek is that the submission is accepted but that the specific area defined in that submission at Submission Table A (the Character Area) is extended to that area on both sides of Collingwood Street between Bronte Street and Manuka Street currently zoned low density residential (the Collingwood Street Area). The reason for my support is that I agree the area has special characteristics that have not been considered sufficiently as a part of the plan change; and the reason I seek extension of the Character Area to the Collingwood Street Area is it is contiguous with the Character Area in submission 605 and it too has special characteristics that warrant protection. Further I note that would be consistent with the treatment of neighbourhood N20-Fairfield Park in regard to Collingwood Street from Manuka Street north - as has been used by Nelson City Council in its availability and proposed neighbourhood panning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.012	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Subdivision	Oppose	The amenity values of the built environment develop and change as a result of appropriately located and designed development that ~~improved for future generations through the subdivision and development processes that~~ achieve all of the following: a. compact and vibrant centres and neighbourhoods, andb. developments that incorporate the values of character Area and surrounding neighbourhoods; and c.	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS64.013	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety. The decision I seek is that the submission is accepted but that the specific area defined in that submission at Submission Table A (the Character Area) is extended to that area on both sides of Collingwood Street between Bronte Street and Manuka Street currently zoned low density residential (the Collingwood Street Area). The reason for my support is that I agree the area has special characteristics that have not been considered sufficiently as a part of the plan change; and the reason I seek extension of the Character Area to the Collingwood Street Area is it is contiguous with the Character Area in submission 605 and it too has special characteristics that warrant protection. Further I note that would be consistent with the treatment of neighbourhood N20-Fairfield Park in regard to Collingwood Street from Manuka Street north - as has been used by Nelson City Council in its availability and proposed neighbourhood panning.	Reject	*Section 6*

S605.013	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Subdivision	Oppose	[Amend] DO14.2.1 [as follows]: The size and shape of allotments created on subdivision is fundamentally linked to the scale, size, and type of structures that can be built, and the spaces around them. Redevelopment of existing sites can also impact amenity values. Providing for an increase in the variety and density of housing enabled in suitable residential areas can improve amenity values for future generations by providing better access to housing close to commercial activities and community services within a vibrant network of centres. At the same time, increasing the density of housing may reduce the amenity values experienced by some people by enabling a greater height and scale of buildings closer to neighbouring boundaries. Development must therefore recognise and consider existing values and character of surrounding neighbourhood during design phase	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS64.014	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety. The decision I seek is that the submission is accepted but that the specific area defined in that submission at Submission Table A (the Character Area) is extended to that area on both sides of Collingwood Street between Bronte Street and Manuka Street currently zoned low density residential (the Collingwood Street Area). The reason for my support is that I agree the area has special characteristics that have not been considered sufficiently as a part of the plan change; and the reason I seek extension of the Character Area to the Collingwood Street Area is it is contiguous with the Character Area in submission 605 and it too has special characteristics that warrant protection. Further I note that would be consistent with the treatment of neighbourhood N20-Fairfield Park in regard to Collingwood Street from Manuka Street north - as has been used by Nelson City Council in its availability and proposed neighbourhood panning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.014	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Subdivision	Oppose	[Amend] DO14.2.1 Allotments [as follows]: The pattern created by subdivision, including allotment sizes, shapes, and dimensions should take into account the range of future potential land uses and the development potential of the area, and any potential adverse effects on the environment and amenity values ~~within the context of the planned built character of the zone~~, and the relationship of the allotments to any	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS64.015	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety. The decision I seek is that the submission is accepted but that the specific area defined in that submission at Submission Table A (the Character Area) is extended to that area on both sides of Collingwood Street between Bronte Street and Manuka Street currently zoned low density residential (the Collingwood Street Area). The reason for my support is that I agree the area has special characteristics that have not been considered sufficiently as a part of the plan change; and the reason I seek extension of the Character Area to the Collingwood Street Area is it is contiguous with the Character Area in submission 605 and it too has special characteristics that warrant protection. Further I note that would be consistent with the treatment of neighbourhood N20-Fairfield Park in regard to Collingwood Street from Manuka Street north - as has been used by Nelson City Council in its availability and proposed neighbourhood panning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.015	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Subdivision	Oppose	[Amend] DGA12.4.iii [as follows]: The subdivision of land for residential purposes should create allotments which are of sufficient size and shape to enable dwellings erected upon them to have usable outdoor space and to allow development at a density which is consistent with the character and values of the neighbourhood. ~~planned built character of the zone or area as~~	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS64.016	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety. The decision I seek is that the submission is accepted but that the specific area defined in that submission at Submission Table A (the Character Area) is extended to that area on both sides of Collingwood Street between Bronte Street and Manuka Street currently zoned low density residential (the Collingwood Street Area). The reason for my support is that I agree the area has special characteristics that have not been considered sufficiently as a part of the plan change; and the reason I seek extension of the Character Area to the Collingwood Street Area is it is contiguous with the Character Area in submission 605 and it too has special characteristics that warrant protection. Further I note that would be consistent with the treatment of neighbourhood N20-Fairfield Park in regard to Collingwood Street from Manuka Street north - as has been used by Nelson City Council in its availability and proposed neighbourhood panning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.016	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Subdivision	Oppose	[Amend] DO14e.3 [as follows]:Maintained or enhanced ~~improved~~ amenity values	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS64.017	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety. The decision I seek is that the submission is accepted but that the specific area defined in that submission at Submission Table A (the Character Area) is extended to that area on both sides of Collingwood Street between Bronte Street and Manuka Street currently zoned low density residential (the Collingwood Street Area). The reason for my support is that I agree the area has special characteristics that have not been considered sufficiently as a part of the plan change; and the reason I seek extension of the Character Area to the Collingwood Street Area is it is contiguous with the Character Area in submission 605 and it too has special characteristics that warrant protection. Further I note that would be consistent with the treatment of neighbourhood N20-Fairfield Park in regard to Collingwood Street from Manuka Street north - as has been used by Nelson City Council in its availability and proposed neighbourhood panning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.017	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Subdivision	Oppose	[Amend] DO14e.3.1 [as follows]: Consistent treatment of resource consent applications. Complaints to Council. Visual inspection.Maintain existing character and amenity values. Increasing	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS64.018	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety. The decision I seek is that the submission is accepted but that the specific area defined in that submission at Submission Table A (the Character Area) is extended to that area on both sides of Collingwood Street between Bronte Street and Manuka Street currently zoned low density residential (the Collingwood Street Area). The reason for my support is that I agree the area has special characteristics that have not been considered sufficiently as a part of the plan change; and the reason I seek extension of the Character Area to the Collingwood Street Area is it is contiguous with the Character Area in submission 605 and it too has special characteristics that warrant protection. Further I note that would be consistent with the treatment of neighbourhood N20-Fairfield Park in regard to Collingwood Street from Manuka Street north - as has been used by Nelson City Council in its availability and proposed neighbourhood panning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.018	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	urban form that supports a well-functioning urban environment in which intensive development is consolidated within existing urban zone boundaries and which avoids or mitigates adverse effects on ecological, character	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS64.019	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety. The decision I seek is that the submission is accepted but that the specific area defined in that submission at Submission Table A (the Character Area) is extended to that area on both sides of Collingwood Street between Bronte Street and Manuka Street currently zoned low density residential (the Collingwood Street Area). The reason for my support is that I agree the area has special characteristics that have not been considered sufficiently as a part of the plan change; and the reason I seek extension of the Character Area to the Collingwood Street Area is it is contiguous with the Character Area in submission 605 and it too has special characteristics that warrant protection. Further I note that would be consistent with the treatment of neighbourhood N20-Fairfield Park in regard to Collingwood Street from Manuka Street north - as has been used by Nelson City Council in its availability and proposed neighbourhood panning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.019	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend] DO15.1.1 [as follows]: To encourage development in suitable locations within the urban area to support an increase in the density and diversity of housing supporting activities in accessible locations, while recognising	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS64.020	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety. The decision I seek is that the submission is accepted but that the specific area defined in that submission at Submission Table A (the Character Area) is extended to that area on both sides of Collingwood Street between Bronte Street and Manuka Street currently zoned low density residential (the Collingwood Street Area). The reason for my support is that I agree the area has special characteristics that have not been considered sufficiently as a part of the plan change; and the reason I seek extension of the Character Area to the Collingwood Street Area is it is contiguous with the Character Area in submission 605 and it too has special characteristics that warrant protection. Further I note that would be consistent with the treatment of neighbourhood N20-Fairfield Park in regard to Collingwood Street from Manuka Street north - as has been used by Nelson City Council in its availability and proposed neighbourhood panning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.021	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend] DO15e.2.1 Environmental results anticipated and performance indicators [as follows]: Consistent treatment of resource consent applications.Maintain existing character and amenity values.	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS64.022	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety. The decision I seek is that the submission is accepted but that the specific area defined in that submission at Submission Table A (the Character Area) is extended to that area on both sides of Collingwood Street between Bronte Street and Manuka Street currently zoned low density residential (the Collingwood Street Area). The reason for my support is that I agree the area has special characteristics that have not been considered sufficiently as a part of the plan change; and the reason I seek extension of the Character Area to the Collingwood Street Area is it is contiguous with the Character Area in submission 605 and it too has special characteristics that warrant protection. Further I note that would be consistent with the treatment of neighbourhood N20-Fairfield Park in regard to Collingwood Street from Manuka Street north - as has been used by Nelson City Council in its availability and proposed neighbourhood panning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.022	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend] DO1.11 [as follows]: The Plan recognises that areas have distinctive environmental characteristics, and what effects of activities are acceptable may differ between areas. The Plan applies a zoning approach to define the different environmental qualities ~~and planned built character sought~~ for different areas and to control the actual and potential adverse effects of development within them. The Plan recognises, through character overlays, where additional	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS64.023	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety. The decision I seek is that the submission is accepted but that the specific area defined in that submission at Submission Table A (the Character Area) is extended to that area on both sides of Collingwood Street between Bronte Street and Manuka Street currently zoned low density residential (the Collingwood Street Area). The reason for my support is that I agree the area has special characteristics that have not been considered sufficiently as a part of the plan change; and the reason I seek extension of the Character Area to the Collingwood Street Area is it is contiguous with the Character Area in submission 605 and it too has special characteristics that warrant protection. Further I note that would be consistent with the treatment of neighbourhood N20-Fairfield Park in regard to Collingwood Street from Manuka Street north - as has been used by Nelson City Council in its availability and proposed neighbourhood panning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.024	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend] DO16.1.1.i [as follows]: The primary goal of the Residential Zone is to provide the opportunity for residential accommodation. Past experience has shown that people want a range of living styles to reflect their various needs, while maintaining high levels of amenity. Nuisances have adverse effects on amenity values, and can affect health and safety in residential areas. Development must be undertaken in a manner that ensure appropriate balance between existing activities while providing for future generations. ~~Over time, the appearance of neighbourhoods will~~	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS64.025	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety. The decision I seek is that the submission is accepted but that the specific area defined in that submission at Submission Table A (the Character Area) is extended to that area on both sides of Collingwood Street between Bronte Street and Manuka Street currently zoned low density residential (the Collingwood Street Area). The reason for my support is that I agree the area has special characteristics that have not been considered sufficiently as a part of the plan change; and the reason I seek extension of the Character Area to the Collingwood Street Area is it is contiguous with the Character Area in submission 605 and it too has special characteristics that warrant protection. Further I note that would be consistent with the treatment of neighbourhood N20-Fairfield Park in regard to Collingwood Street from Manuka Street north - as has been used by Nelson City Council in its availability and proposed neighbourhood panning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.027	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend] REd.1 [as follows]: Nelson's residential areas are ~~have been~~ characterised by low rise dwelling houses on individual lots. Past architectural styles, settlement periods and geographic factors have determined residential character and form, with the varying topography of the city resulting in a range of individual neighbourhoods. This plan seeks to identify and protect the	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS64.028	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*

S605.028	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend] REd.3 [as follows]: The settlement pattern of Nelson is reflected in its geographic setting. The earliest settled parts are within the lower flood plains of the Maitai River, and The Brook and York Valley Streams. Initial development of these areas occurred in the 1840s, with a number of buildings from the 19th century still remaining. ~~There are several streets, precincts, and many individual buildings within Nelson that have heritage significance, and this Plan seeks to encourage their preservation and enhancement.~~ There are many, streets, Character	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS64.029	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.029	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend] REd.6 [as follows]: Residential areas provide the place where most people sleep and enjoy their leisure time, and quiet, peaceful surroundings are expected. ~~, within the context of an intensifying city.~~	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS64.030	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*

S605.030	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend] REd.9 [as follows]: The purpose of the General Residential, Medium Density Residential and High Density Residential zones is to collectively provide for housing choice and diversity within well-designed neighbourhoods that have good levels of residential amenity.~~The greatest density of housing is enabled in the High Density Residential Zone, which is in close walking distance to the main centres, with the Medium Density Residential Zone applying within reasonable walking distance. This recognises the importance of enabling the efficient use of land in accessible locations, where people can easily walk or cycle to meet their daily needs. Elsewhere, the General Residential Zone,~~	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS64.031	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*

S605.031	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend] REd.10 [as follows]: ~~Over time, the appearance and character of neighbourhoods will change as new development occurs, to achieve the planned built character of the zones as described in the objectives and policies. Collectively, General Residential, Medium Density Residential and High Density Residential zones enable a variety of housing densities, in a variety of forms, including detached, semi-detached, terraced housing and apartments. In achieving the planned built character of the zone, development will have regard to the amenity values of existing residential sites, acknowledging that this is more~~	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS64.032	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.032	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend] RE1.1 Densities [as follows]: A choice of building densities should be provided within the city, taking into account people's preferences, precinct and Character Area values, the existing and planned built character of the Area (as outlined in the policies below),	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS64.033	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*

S605.033	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend] RE1.2 Flexibility in development [as follows]: a. integrates the design of residential units and any subdivision, and that all required resource consents are applied for concurrently, along with any building consent or building sketch plans, and b. presents a high standard of on site and off site amenity, and c. is designed with regard to existing character and precincts values; and d. is designed with regard to the existing and planned built character of the area, and e. the cumulative effects of such developments do not significantly change the density of the area~~or detrimentally affect its planned built character~~, and f. does not diminish the streetscape of	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS64.034	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.038	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Insert] new RE1.8.iv [as follows]:Overlays (such as Character Area) identify rules that require additional consideration of the surrounding environment. This ensures high quality living	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS64.039	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.039	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend] RE2.4 Privacy and Outlook [as follows]: The location and design of buildings should not unduly compromise outlook and privacy of adjoining development, having regard to ~~the planned built character of~~	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS64.040	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.040	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend] RE2.5 Scale [as follows]: The size and scale of buildings, structures, and activities should be compatible with the ~~planned built~~ character and amenity of the	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS64.041	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*

S605.041	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Insert] new RE2.5.vi [as follows]:Overlays (such as Character Areas) identify rules that require additional consideration of the surrounding environment. This ensures high	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS64.042	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.042	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend] RE2.9.i [as follows]: Enable development of multiple residential units on a site where the development provides minimum building size, outlook from habitable rooms, on site landscaped areas and private open space suitable to the housing types enabled by the zone. ~~Quality developments will enable as many people as possible to independently use and interact with the on site living environments.~~ Development will recognise values and character of surrounding neighbourhood. A high standard of amenity is expected to be achieved through the use of carefully considered design techniques and features which respond to the site's context and setting, and take into consideration the urban design	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS64.043	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.043	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Insert] new RE2.9.iii [as follows]:Overlays (such as Character Area) identify rules that require additional consideration of the surrounding environment. This ensures high quality living	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS64.044	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*

S605.044	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend] RE3.2.iv [as follows]. Define key views on the Planning Maps and in Appendix 9. The plan identifies and protects view shafts and gateways through the use of character precincts or overlays to ensure that development protects	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS64.045	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.045	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Insert] new RE3.9 [as follows]:Insertion of Character Area OverlayCharacter Areas identify groupings of interrelated, but not necessarily contiguous items, places or features (including views) that collectively reflect neighbourhood character. Character Areas may include both contributing and non-contributing items, places or features.ExplanationThe values of Character Areas shall be maintained and enhanced, having regard:i. to the original pattern of development within the Character Area including the relationship of buildings to their site, to neighbouring sites, and to the street;ii. to the contribution existing buildings and fences make, to the Character Area as a whole; andiii. to the extent to which additions and alterations to existing buildings, or the construction of new buildings or fences, are consistent with the built characteristics of the Character	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS34.002	Jane Peterson		Support	Accept	I agree with the submitter that the area mapped out in Table 1 of their submission should be zoned General Residential. Alternatively I support their suggestion that this area be subject to a Character Area Overlay requiring detailed consideration of built form in exceedance of specific General Residential performance standards. There are many streets, Character Areas, heritage precincts, and individual buildings within Nelson that have significance, and the submitter's plan seeks to encourage preservation and enhancement of those values.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS64.046	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.049	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Insert] new [to] Table 9.1: Viewscapes Insert new critical views to ensure protection of views from top of Cumberland Street, Ngati Tama and Ngati Awa streets toward City Centre/Port. Critical View should extend to Nelson Boys College grounds. Threats include Skyline, openness, retain views to sea; Heights of	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS64.050	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*
S606.010	David Ayre	Mapping	Amend	Widen intensification to Stoke then other areas of the city, step by step, taking into consideration the thoughts of residents of that area and any particular needs such as heritage areas.	As the city centre is being intensified, intensification should widen to Stoke and then other areas of the city, step by step. As each area of intensification is planned, the levels of intensification should be clearly established to meet the needs at that time, in conjunction with the residents of that area, and any particular needs such as heritage areas. In all cases existing buildings and daylight angles should be protected at their current levels, unless changes are accepted by the residents concerned.	Reject	*Section 6*
S606.011	David Ayre	Residential Zones	Amend	[Retain] existing buildings and daylight angles at their current levels, unless changes are accepted by the residents concerned	Refer to reasons in submission point S606.010.	Reject	*Section 6*
S606.013	David Ayre	Residential Zones	Amend	Include and encourage small scale infill developments in Intensification.	Intensification should include and encourage small scale infill developments, because these can provide very diverse and adaptable changes very quickly.	Accept	*Section 6*

S606.020	David Ayre	Residential Zones	Amend	[Encourage or require] long term empty properties to be occupied.	Long term empty properties. These should be occupied, using any means available to stop them lying empty.	Reject	*Section 6*
S608.004	Nelsust Inc. - Peter Olorenshaw	Residential Zones	Amend	Require deciduous trees on every residential street, starting in the streets that are to be the highest density.	As we densify our urban areas, large trees are no longer appropriate on our sections. Shrubs and small trees yes, but we must move to the situation of having our large trees in parks but also on every street. While we recognise challenges with having trees in paved areas, they are not insurmountable with permeable paving and careful species selection. Trees bring multiple benefits: mental health, birdlife corridors, carbon sinks and as a means of cooling the ground. It has been found in European heat waves that streets with trees were some 5° cooler than those without trees and resulted in markedly fewer heat-stress health issues for people living in those streets. Having trees on streets means the speed we will subconsciously drive at will be lower and so the resulting street is safer. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.149	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with this point.	Reject	*Section 6*
S608.008	Nelsust Inc. - Peter Olorenshaw	Residential Zones	Support	Keep 2 stories (8m) maximum permitted building height in the General Residential Zone.	People are comfortable with 2 stories as of right and 8m is only 500mm higher than the 7.5m max height we presently have.	Accept	*Section 6*

S608.009	Nelsust Inc. - Peter Olorenshaw	Residential Zones	Amend	Change the recession planes to keep the current daylight over regulations [from Appendix 15] for boundaries oriented within 45 degrees of true south, and change to a 45° recession plane starting at 5m above ground level on boundaries oriented within 45 degrees of true north, in all 3 new residential zones [with additional changes for the south oriented boundaries in the Medium and High Density Residential Zones as outlined in submission points S608.018 and S608.019]. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Nelson is unusual with the existing Nelson Resource Management Plan having recession planes that vary depending on the direction the boundary faces so that winter sunlight, not just daylight, is allowed into your neighbours property. The recession plane for a Southern boundary is a quite low 25° taken from 2.5m above ground level. Other boundaries have steeper angles (35° for East and West boundaries and 45° for Northern boundaries. This is proposed to be radically changed - even in ordinary residential areas... Initially our convenor thought yes this is something we have to change - he has been a solar architect all his working life but suggests we now know how to build houses that need virtually no heating, without relying on winter sun. However this is no relief to someone in an old draughty bungalow. These old houses are literally impossible to insulate or draft proof as efficiently as a new house and many of them rely on winter sun coming over their neighbours' properties to keep them remotely liveable without large external heat inputs. The existing daylight over provisions actually allow quite a lot more development on existing sites than is often supposed. [See the original submission appendix for more detail]... However, there is nothing in plan change 29 that deals with the issue of transitioning to a townhouse typology in our higher density areas, with a cold draughty bungalow to the south of a new high rise apartment building. We offer a solution for transitioning to a townhouse typology. We ask that you change the recession planes and yard setbacks in Plan Change 29 to keep the current daylight over regulations for "Southern" Boundaries but allow building up to "Northern" boundaries - 2 stories high and with 45° recession plane above that... So although this would restrict the amount of DAYlight into your neighbour's south side windows, it would not restrict the SUNlight. AND the additional rule that once someone has built up 2 stores high to your "Southern" boundary	Reject	*Section 6*

S608.010	Nelsust Inc. - Peter Olorenshaw	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend the building setback rules [Other Yards rules REr.17E, 18E, 19E] to allow buildings right up to the side boundaries be retained in all zones, with additional changes to the medium and high density zone daylight admission rules as per submission point S608.018 and S608.019.	We find it curious the proposals no longer allow people to build up to the boundaries (as of right) in the medium and high density areas. This leads to townhouses not having side walls touching, even in the highest density residential areas and we think this is wrong. Currently you can do this in all residential zones as long as you fit under the recession planes. This is really something we should hold on to and actually build on to. We request that the current ability to build right up to the side boundaries be retained in all zones and extended as noted above so that in at least the medium and high density zones, you can build 2 storeys high up to your "Northern" boundary as of right, and once your Southern neighbour has done that, you can build 2 storeys high up to that boundary too.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S608.011	Nelsust Inc. - Peter Olorenshaw	Residential Zones	Amend	[Increase permitted] building coverage to 55% in all residential zones.	A significant finding of the 2006 Nelson Urban Growth Strategy was to "Grow In" rather than "Grow Out". This has been misinterpreted as "Growing Up" rather than "Growing Out", but it is not the same thing and this is where we think the present plan change proposals have seriously missed what people are presently comfortable with. So along with the proposals to go too high as of right, are the proposals to have site coverages too low - Currently ranging from a low of 30% to a high of 40% and proposed only to go up to 50% in even the highest density areas. We request building coverage should be 55% in all zones - this is still allowing more than a 45% of the land to be used for vegetation... and in allowing more building coverage, we request permeable landscaping areas to be increased (refer to submission point S608.012).	Reject	*Section 6*

S608.012	Nelsust Inc. - Peter Olorenshaw	Residential Zones	Amend	Increase the minimum permeable landscape areas to 25% in all zones.	Partly in response to our request in increase allowable building coverage to 55%, we asked for the % of permeable be increased. This will mean the building plus impermeable paving would be the same as the PC29 current proposals. We note permeable landscaping is easier to do now with permeable paving that looks superficially no different to regular hard paving as well as paving such as open concrete blocks with grass growing through it.	Reject	*Section 6*
S610.006	Sarah Little	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the changes to daylight angles for all zoning areas. These should not be changed at all.	Access to daylight is hugely important for human health and wellbeing. Removing these provisions means it will be difficult for people to live sustainably by growing their own food or making solar energy. Existing residents will be disproportionately affected.	Reject	*Section 6*
S614.005	Redbox Architects 2017 Ltd	Residential Zones	Amend	[Amend the plan change so that the] number of residential units permitted is not limited but [is controlled by the application of] "minimum dwelling design standards"	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S616.006	Loretta Hogg	Residential Zones	Oppose	Retain only rules and their status that are required by government legislation. With all other rules for construction of multi-storey residential developments within all Residential Zones to be Discretionary or Non-complying, requiring the application to be notified.	Consents, consultation, permits, even if one were diligently paying attention to the notices - which might be published or not - the scope of matters of how/what we could challenge the developers on via submissions/court - is confusing, time consuming, would be costly, and possibly could be resolved with a slight change, a tweak, by somebody, negotiated to fix things so the building goes ahead, unbeknown to us. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S616.007	Loretta Hogg	Residential Zones	Oppose	Require a social and amenity wellbeing impact assessment for all multi-storey residential applications in the HRZ and GRZ.	We all thought this was where we would enjoy our latter years of life and now we live in fear of what could happen to our privacy, sunlight into our house, people overlooking our little back gardens, the noise, the traffic, and we know we are a tiny voice -- and we don't have control over what will happen. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S617.009	Sarah Holman	Residential Zones	Oppose	Develop rules to allow 2 dwellings within one house in larger properties with [existing] amenity controls in NRMP; review Development Contributions Policy to support this.	An additional provision to allow larger houses to be able to be turned into 2 dwellings would be a cheaper and cost effective way of increasing housing units. This would require a review the definition of dwelling and the Development Contributions Policy. This would allow sustainable use of larger homes and mean that people who have lived in a neighbourhood do not have to leave their social support networks, something Nelson residents are proud of.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS61.102	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submissions that we support/:- The breadth of change proposed is dramatic. There is a considerable amount of information to study before being able to respond meaningfully to the proposal. For this reason, non-statutory consultation prior to the notification of the Plan Change was inadequate. Public meetings and the development of neighbourhood spatial plans could have considerably reduced the number of submissions and concern in the community. Nelson is a very creative, skilled community and has the expertise to produce informed plans for a level of intensification whilst retaining Nelson's unique character and amenity. High Density Zoning is inappropriate to the scale of Nelson's character and neighbourhoods. For that reason, I wish to see these areas rezoned general residential zone. I support a level of intensification that would allow an additional 2 bedroom housing unit on a section with careful amenity controls in line with those in the current Resource Management Plan. An additional provision to allow larger houses to be able to be turned into 2 dwellings would be a cheaper and cost effective way of increasing housing units. This would require a review the definition of dwelling and the Development Contributions Policy. This would allow sustainable use of larger homes and mean that people who have lived in a neighbourhood do not have to leave their social support networks, something Nelson residents are proud of. In 2010 a comprehensive study of Nelson's heritage was carried out for Nelson City Council by conservation architect, Ian Bowman, and archaeologist, Amanda Young. In addition, a Thematic Historical Overview of Nelson City" by Dr. John Wilson identified that several key categories of heritage were missing from the predominately residential list in the NRMP. Council spent considerable resources on this work and it could be updated. The work for this Plan Change evaluating the listed property in the NRMP has	Reject	*Section 6*

FS72.106	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submissions that we support/:- The breadth of change proposed is dramatic. There is a considerable amount of information to study before being able to respond meaningfully to the proposal. For this reason, non-statutory consultation prior to the notification of the Plan Change was inadequate. Public meetings and the development of neighbourhood spatial plans could have considerably reduced the number of submissions and concern in the community. Nelson is a very creative, skilled community and has the expertise to produce informed plans for a level of intensification whilst retaining Nelson's unique character and amenity. High Density Zoning is inappropriate to the scale of Nelson's character and neighbourhoods. For that reason, I wish to see these areas rezoned general residential zone. I support a level of intensification that would allow an additional 2 bedroom housing unit on a section with careful amenity controls in line with those in the current Resource Management Plan. An additional provision to allow larger houses to be able to be turned into 2 dwellings would be a cheaper and cost effective way of increasing housing units. This would require a review the definition of dwelling and the Development Contributions Policy. This would allow sustainable use of larger homes and mean that people who have lived in a neighbourhood do not have to leave their social support networks, something Nelson residents are proud of. In 2010 a comprehensive study of Nelson's heritage was carried out for Nelson City Council by conservation architect, Ian Bowman, and archaeologist, Amanda Young. In addition, a Thematic Historical Overview of Nelson City" by Dr. John Wilson identified that several key categories of heritage were missing from the predominately residential list in the NRMP. Council spent considerable resources on this work and it could be updated. The work for this Plan Change evaluating the listed property in the NRMP has	Reject	*Section 6*

FS60.097	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submissions that we support/:- The breadth of change proposed is dramatic. There is a considerable amount of information to study before being able to respond meaningfully to the proposal. For this reason, non-statutory consultation prior to the notification of the Plan Change was inadequate. Public meetings and the development of neighbourhood spatial plans could have considerably reduced the number of submissions and concern in the community. Nelson is a very creative, skilled community and has the expertise to produce informed plans for a level of intensification whilst retaining Nelson's unique character and amenity. High Density Zoning is inappropriate to the scale of Nelson's character and neighbourhoods. For that reason, I wish to see these areas rezoned general residential zone. I support a level of intensification that would allow an additional 2 bedroom housing unit on a section with careful amenity controls in line with those in the current Resource Management Plan. An additional provision to allow larger houses to be able to be turned into 2 dwellings would be a cheaper and cost effective way of increasing housing units. This would require a review the definition of dwelling and the Development Contributions Policy. This would allow sustainable use of larger homes and mean that people who have lived in a neighbourhood do not have to leave their social support networks, something Nelson residents are proud of. In 2010 a comprehensive study of Nelson's heritage was carried out for Nelson City Council by conservation architect, Ian Bowman, and archaeologist, Amanda Young. In addition, a Thematic Historical Overview of Nelson City" by Dr. John Wilson identified that several key categories of heritage were missing from the predominately residential list in the NRMP. Council spent considerable resources on this work and it could be updated. The work for this Plan Change evaluating the listed property in the NRMP has	Reject	*Section 6*
S617.010	Sarah Holman	Residential Zones	Oppose	Retain existing amenity controls in residential zones, including setbacks and daylight controls.	Without stricter rules and polices, and the need for resource consent for intensification projects, it is inevitable that quality of life for many Nelson residents will be affected.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS61.103	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submissions that we support/:- The breadth of change proposed is dramatic. There is a considerable amount of information to study before being able to respond meaningfully to the proposal. For this reason, non-statutory consultation prior to the notification of the Plan Change was inadequate. Public meetings and the development of neighbourhood spatial plans could have considerably reduced the number of submissions and concern in the community. Nelson is a very creative, skilled community and has the expertise to produce informed plans for a level of intensification whilst retaining Nelson's unique character and amenity. High Density Zoning is inappropriate to the scale of Nelson's character and neighbourhoods. For that reason, I wish to see these areas rezoned general residential zone. I support a level of intensification that would allow an additional 2 bedroom housing unit on a section with careful amenity controls in line with those in the current Resource Management Plan. An additional provision to allow larger houses to be able to be turned into 2 dwellings would be a cheaper and cost effective way of increasing housing units. This would require a review the definition of dwelling and the Development Contributions Policy. This would allow sustainable use of larger homes and mean that people who have lived in a neighbourhood do not have to leave their social support networks, something Nelson residents are proud of. In 2010 a comprehensive study of Nelson's heritage was carried out for Nelson City Council by conservation architect, Ian Bowman, and archaeologist, Amanda Young. In addition, a Thematic Historical Overview of Nelson City" by Dr. John Wilson identified that several key categories of heritage were missing from the predominately residential list in the NRMP. Council spent considerable resources on this work and it could be updated. The work for this Plan Change evaluating the listed property in the NRMP has	Reject	*Section 6*

FS72.107	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submissions that we support/:- The breadth of change proposed is dramatic. There is a considerable amount of information to study before being able to respond meaningfully to the proposal. For this reason, non-statutory consultation prior to the notification of the Plan Change was inadequate. Public meetings and the development of neighbourhood spatial plans could have considerably reduced the number of submissions and concern in the community. Nelson is a very creative, skilled community and has the expertise to produce informed plans for a level of intensification whilst retaining Nelson's unique character and amenity. High Density Zoning is inappropriate to the scale of Nelson's character and neighbourhoods. For that reason, I wish to see these areas rezoned general residential zone. I support a level of intensification that would allow an additional 2 bedroom housing unit on a section with careful amenity controls in line with those in the current Resource Management Plan. An additional provision to allow larger houses to be able to be turned into 2 dwellings would be a cheaper and cost effective way of increasing housing units. This would require a review the definition of dwelling and the Development Contributions Policy. This would allow sustainable use of larger homes and mean that people who have lived in a neighbourhood do not have to leave their social support networks, something Nelson residents are proud of. In 2010 a comprehensive study of Nelson's heritage was carried out for Nelson City Council by conservation architect, Ian Bowman, and archaeologist, Amanda Young. In addition, a Thematic Historical Overview of Nelson City" by Dr. John Wilson identified that several key categories of heritage were missing from the predominately residential list in the NRMP. Council spent considerable resources on this work and it could be updated. The work for this Plan Change evaluating the listed property in the NRMP has	Reject	*Section 6*

FS60.098	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submissions that we support/:- The breadth of change proposed is dramatic. There is a considerable amount of information to study before being able to respond meaningfully to the proposal. For this reason, non-statutory consultation prior to the notification of the Plan Change was inadequate. Public meetings and the development of neighbourhood spatial plans could have considerably reduced the number of submissions and concern in the community. Nelson is a very creative, skilled community and has the expertise to produce informed plans for a level of intensification whilst retaining Nelson's unique character and amenity. High Density Zoning is inappropriate to the scale of Nelson's character and neighbourhoods. For that reason, I wish to see these areas rezoned general residential zone. I support a level of intensification that would allow an additional 2 bedroom housing unit on a section with careful amenity controls in line with those in the current Resource Management Plan. An additional provision to allow larger houses to be able to be turned into 2 dwellings would be a cheaper and cost effective way of increasing housing units. This would require a review the definition of dwelling and the Development Contributions Policy. This would allow sustainable use of larger homes and mean that people who have lived in a neighbourhood do not have to leave their social support networks, something Nelson residents are proud of. In 2010 a comprehensive study of Nelson's heritage was carried out for Nelson City Council by conservation architect, Ian Bowman, and archaeologist, Amanda Young. In addition, a Thematic Historical Overview of Nelson City" by Dr. John Wilson identified that several key categories of heritage were missing from the predominately residential list in the NRMP. Council spent considerable resources on this work and it could be updated. The work for this Plan Change evaluating the listed property in the NRMP has	Reject	*Section 6*
S617.031	Sarah Holman	Residential Zones	Support in part	[Support] a level of intensification that would allow an additional 1 storey housing unit on a residential section with careful amenity controls in line with those in the current Nelson	Refer to reasons in submission point S617.008.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS61.126	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submissions that we support/:- The breadth of change proposed is dramatic. There is a considerable amount of information to study before being able to respond meaningfully to the proposal. For this reason, non-statutory consultation prior to the notification of the Plan Change was inadequate. Public meetings and the development of neighbourhood spatial plans could have considerably reduced the number of submissions and concern in the community. Nelson is a very creative, skilled community and has the expertise to produce informed plans for a level of intensification whilst retaining Nelson's unique character and amenity. High Density Zoning is inappropriate to the scale of Nelson's character and neighbourhoods. For that reason, I wish to see these areas rezoned general residential zone. I support a level of intensification that would allow an additional 2 bedroom housing unit on a section with careful amenity controls in line with those in the current Resource Management Plan. An additional provision to allow larger houses to be able to be turned into 2 dwellings would be a cheaper and cost effective way of increasing housing units. This would require a review the definition of dwelling and the Development Contributions Policy. This would allow sustainable use of larger homes and mean that people who have lived in a neighbourhood do not have to leave their social support networks, something Nelson residents are proud of. In 2010 a comprehensive study of Nelson's heritage was carried out for Nelson City Council by conservation architect, Ian Bowman, and archaeologist, Amanda Young. In addition, a Thematic Historical Overview of Nelson City" by Dr. John Wilson identified that several key categories of heritage were missing from the predominately residential list in the NRMP. Council spent considerable resources on this work and it could be updated. The work for this Plan Change evaluating the listed property in the NRMP has	Reject	*Section 6*

FS72.129	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submissions that we support/:- The breadth of change proposed is dramatic. There is a considerable amount of information to study before being able to respond meaningfully to the proposal. For this reason, non-statutory consultation prior to the notification of the Plan Change was inadequate. Public meetings and the development of neighbourhood spatial plans could have considerably reduced the number of submissions and concern in the community. Nelson is a very creative, skilled community and has the expertise to produce informed plans for a level of intensification whilst retaining Nelson's unique character and amenity. High Density Zoning is inappropriate to the scale of Nelson's character and neighbourhoods. For that reason, I wish to see these areas rezoned general residential zone. I support a level of intensification that would allow an additional 2 bedroom housing unit on a section with careful amenity controls in line with those in the current Resource Management Plan. An additional provision to allow larger houses to be able to be turned into 2 dwellings would be a cheaper and cost effective way of increasing housing units. This would require a review the definition of dwelling and the Development Contributions Policy. This would allow sustainable use of larger homes and mean that people who have lived in a neighbourhood do not have to leave their social support networks, something Nelson residents are proud of. In 2010 a comprehensive study of Nelson's heritage was carried out for Nelson City Council by conservation architect, Ian Bowman, and archaeologist, Amanda Young. In addition, a Thematic Historical Overview of Nelson City" by Dr. John Wilson identified that several key categories of heritage were missing from the predominately residential list in the NRMP. Council spent considerable resources on this work and it could be updated. The work for this Plan Change evaluating the listed property in the NRMP has	Reject	*Section 6*

FS60.119	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submissions that we support/:- The breadth of change proposed is dramatic. There is a considerable amount of information to study before being able to respond meaningfully to the proposal. For this reason, non-statutory consultation prior to the notification of the Plan Change was inadequate. Public meetings and the development of neighbourhood spatial plans could have considerably reduced the number of submissions and concern in the community. Nelson is a very creative, skilled community and has the expertise to produce informed plans for a level of intensification whilst retaining Nelson's unique character and amenity. High Density Zoning is inappropriate to the scale of Nelson's character and neighbourhoods. For that reason, I wish to see these areas rezoned general residential zone. I support a level of intensification that would allow an additional 2 bedroom housing unit on a section with careful amenity controls in line with those in the current Resource Management Plan. An additional provision to allow larger houses to be able to be turned into 2 dwellings would be a cheaper and cost effective way of increasing housing units. This would require a review the definition of dwelling and the Development Contributions Policy. This would allow sustainable use of larger homes and mean that people who have lived in a neighbourhood do not have to leave their social support networks, something Nelson residents are proud of. In 2010 a comprehensive study of Nelson's heritage was carried out for Nelson City Council by conservation architect, Ian Bowman, and archaeologist, Amanda Young. In addition, a Thematic Historical Overview of Nelson City" by Dr. John Wilson identified that several key categories of heritage were missing from the predominately residential list in the NRMP. Council spent considerable resources on this work and it could be updated. The work for this Plan Change evaluating the listed property in the NRMP has	Reject	*Section 6*

S618.001	Ren Kempthorne	Residential Zones	Amend	[Seeks that resource consent is required for new housing with increased building heights].	Some new housing is required for the current population. But the estimated population growth unjustified. Building higher is sensible, but specific resource consent is essential for the sake of context and design; a building must look good and relate appropriately to others. Thus Nelson can remain a "smart little city" as Council calls it, not become a developer's paradise. NB We should not aspire to be the northern Queenstown, which is why we don't need a gondola!	Reject	*Section 6*
S620.002	Roger Sowman	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S620.003	Roger Sowman	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S620.004	Roger Sowman	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S622.001	Jonathan McCallum	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain the ability to build up to side boundaries in all zones.	I agree with the intent of the plan change but think the plan could do more to encourage the development of townhouses in medium and high density zones. The proposal no longer allows people to build up to the boundaries (as of right) in the medium and high density areas. This leads to townhouses not having side walls touching, even in the highest density residential areas. Currently you can do this in all residential zones as long as you fit under the recession planes. In at least the medium and high density zones, you should be allowed to build 2 storeys high up to your "Northern" boundary as of right, and once your Southern neighbour has done that, you are then allowed to build 2 storeys high up to that boundary too.	Accept	*Section 6*

S623.010	Alistair Kwan	Residential Zones	Oppose	• Incorporate better protections for neighbour's sun - Which may come in various forms, such as: financial compensation for lost area-sun-hours (area of shade, integrated over time of shading) recognizing that the imposed costs are, in effect, forever. core conservative recession planes. guaranteed area-sunlight-hours (square meters of direct sun, integrated over exposure time, at winter solstice) on open ground in at least some residential land-use zones. compensatory garden space e.g. through rooftop and courtyard gardens on new buildings or lifetime allotments on community garden sites nearby. compensatory garden space along roadsides.	Extensive mention has been already of people losing the usefulness of solar photovoltaic cells and direct insulation water heaters due to shading by new, tall buildings being erected next-door. The loss of photovoltaic generation capacity is of significance not only to the occupant, but also on a national scale as it conflicts with government efforts to implement a distributed buffer against overshooting electrical demand peaks. This distributed buffer comprises residential batteries, for which immense comfort has already been provided to Solar Zero. There are also other losses to consider: - Lost winter heat gain through insulation on the roof and walls. Such loss would reduce the effectiveness of humidity removal systems that rely on preheated air and the roof cavity, and would increase the need for heating the interior living spaces. The results, and both cases, are increased costs to the occupants. - Lost food production through shading of gardens, resulting in increased food costs. - Lost recreational gardening prospects through shading of gardens, resulting in reduced mental health through general cultural and leisure impoverishment rush.	Reject	*Section 6*
S623.011	Alistair Kwan	Residential Zones	Oppose	Adjust recession planes and set back lines to allow terraced housing across sections in the innermost land use zones. so that immediately adjacent walls, and indeed party walls, can be a means of thermal control - they neither take in solar heat nor radiate it to space.	So that immediately adjacent walls, and indeed party walls, can be a means of thermal control - they neither take in solar heat nor radiate it to space. Refer also to reasons in submission point S623.010.	Reject	*Section 6*

S623.014	Alistair Kwan	Residential Zones	Oppose	Protect against the imposition of antisocial wall views.	Similarly, consider the fine specimen of aggressive, antisocial architecture that was erected behind 105 Grove Street. The home is delightful from the front, but the backyard has been made into a nasty hellhole by the deliberately imposition of horrible two-story buildings on the site behind it. This literally an arse-end view: the neighbours are greeted with grubby el-cheapo stucco punctuated by toilet windows and plumbing vents. Considerable concern has been expressed that developers will do similarly elsewhere in the city.	Reject	*Section 6*

S624.002	Bridget Dadds	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Support the building of 3 storey (not 6) in ALL areas of Nelson where there is no loss of light or view to neighbouring properties, and it is suitable from a geographical and infrastructural aspect. Any disruption to light or access or view should initiate (at the developers cost) a meeting between parties for resolution.	We are very good at measuring the measurable. Angles, percentages. But how to you measure the feeling of joy from the warmth of sun on your face, or conversely the feeling of anger at no longer being able to enjoy a view you once had, because of a building that's now blocking your line of sight? Following the earthquake rebuild in the hill regions of Christchurch where consents were loosened to speed up the repair and rebuild of houses there, many residents with views they had paid a great deal of money for, found themselves looking at the southern wall of their neighbour rather than their view over the city. It created a great deal of anger and despair. It destroyed people's lives and torn once friendly neighborhoods apart. Making it legal doesn't make it moral. Allowing this to happen legally would divide the community and pit neighbour against neighbour. You cannot measure the stress that this plan change would create, or the toll on people's mental health. Areas that are appropriate with Nelson for 3 storey buildings: The corner of Nile Street and Dommet Sts. This large parcel of building and land which one assumes is for development would suit 3 story townhouses. Perhaps areas of the Port could be developed for housing.	Reject	*Section 6*
S624.006	Bridget Dadds	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Seeks to ensure] there is a pathway for affected neighbours to be heard and compensated (if chosen), at the developers cost, not the Councils.	To allow 3 to 6 storey units to be built without any consultation to neighbours or the immediate neighbourhood is unfair, unjust and offers a poorly planned option for the residents of Nelson to respond to. Our homes are our castle. They're not a commodity or investment. They are the product of a lifetime of financial and emotional investment. To allow one's enjoyment of that to be affected without consultation is unfair and if allowed to proceed will have a tremendous social cost.	Reject	*Section 6*

S625.012	Resilienz Ltd Lindsay Wood	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend the maximum permitted building height in the General Residential Zone to 8m for timber ground floor construction; and 7.4m for concrete ground floor construction.	Refer to reasons in submission points S625.009 and S625.010.	Reject	*Section 6*
S625.013	Resilienz Ltd Lindsay Wood	Residential Zones	Amend	Link the maximum height of a building to the number of dwellings that it contains and the size of the site being devleoped.	We are opposed to the notion implicit in the proposed zone rules that an owner could develop un to the maximum height even with just a single dwelling. This is contrary to the intention of urban intensification and contrary to the spirit of an effects based approach to planning. As it stands under the PC20 proposal an owner of an HRZ site could building a single dwelling 19.5m high. We consider there should be constraints that relate the maximum height of a building in regard to the number of dwellings that it contains and the size of the site being developed. We are not conversant with rules to that effect and consider council should develop suitable mechanisms.	Reject	*Section 6*
S626.002	Raine Estate Oaklands Ltd	Residential Zones	Amend	Review and amend the site coverage rules [REr.17C, REr.18C and REr.19C] to ensure they are individually workable, practical, effective and allow for good outcomes to be achieved.	The Plan Change introduces numerous bulk and location standards for the residential zones, which together create greater need for compliance in development proposals and in turn can impede innovative design The greater level of control over residential development can result in less flexibility in quality design and site specific outcomes. This in turn can impact diversity in character and amenity outcomes and can limit housing choice. More controls can also have the effect of resulting in greater costs to the development process, which in turn impacts affordability. The limitations in above will be exacerbated without opportunity for greenfield development on appropriate sites, such as the Oaklands Farm land.	Reject	*Section 6*
S626.003	Raine Estate Oaklands Ltd	Residential Zones	Amend	Review and amend the front yard rules [REr.17D, REr.18D and REr.19D] to ensure they are individually workable, practical, effective and allow for good outcomes to be	Refer to reasons in submission point S626.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
S626.004	Raine Estate Oaklands Ltd	Residential Zones	Amend	Review and amend the other yards rules [REr.17E, REr.18E and REr.19E] to ensure they are individually workable, practical, effective and allow for good outcomes to be	Refer to reasons in submission point S626.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

S626.005	Raine Estate Oaklands Ltd	Residential Zones	Amend	Review and amend the building height rules [REr.17J, REr.18J and REr.19J] to ensure they are individually workable, practical, effective and allow for good outcomes to be achieved	Refer to reasons in submission point S626.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
S626.006	Raine Estate Oaklands Ltd	Residential Zones	Amend	Review and amend the daylight admission rules [REr.17K, REr.18K and REr.19K] to ensure they are individually workable, practical, effective and allow for good outcomes to be	Refer to reasons in submission point S626.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
S626.007	Raine Estate Oaklands Ltd	Residential Zones	Amend	Review and amend the glazing to the street rules [REr.17M, REr.18M and REr.19M] to ensure they are individually workable, practical, effective and allow for good outcomes to be	Refer to reasons in submission point S626.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
S626.008	Raine Estate Oaklands Ltd	Residential Zones	Amend	Review and amend the outlook and privacy rules [REr.17L, REr.18L and REr.19L] to ensure they are individually workable, practical, effective and allow for good outcomes to be	Refer to reasons in submission point S626.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
S626.009	Raine Estate Oaklands Ltd	Residential Zones	Amend	Review and amend the permeable landscaped area rules [REr.17H, REr.18H and REr.19H] to ensure they are individually workable, practical, effective and allow for good outcomes to be	Refer to reasons in submission point S626.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
S626.013	Raine Estate Oaklands Ltd	Residential Zones	Amend	Review and amend all the building bulk and location rules in the residential zones to ensure they are workable, practical, effective and allow for good outcomes to be achieved as a package.	Bulk and location controls within a residential zone should work together as a package. Each standard has multiple benefits and overlap in what they achieve. As a result not all bulk and location standards available are necessarily required to attain the desired level of amenity. For example height in relation controls by default manage building/yard setbacks. As such in determining the correct mix of bulk and location controls, they need to be considered as a package rather than on their individual merit. As a result of the package of bulk and location standards, in reality the Plan Change will limit opportunities for residential growth and housing choice in Nelson.	Reject	*Section 6*
S627.003	Philip Guy	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Development Guidelines should be established to encourage quality design and development that is sympathetic to the existing environment. These guidelines can be incorporated as part of permitted site development controls broadened to provide better outcomes. As part of these guidelines consideration should be given to dwelling standards such as distance between dwellings, private open space, outlook, accessibility, size of dwelling, ventilation	Refer to reasons in submission point S627.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

S628.019	Janet Whittington	Residential Zones	Not Stated	look at low rise answers to intensification.	Architects have been designing a range of low rise intensification housing for years here. E.g. If they were built on only half the number of potential infill housing available, they would completely cater to Nelson's needs for the next 10-15 years. This would give us time to develop an excellent future for the whole city.	Reject	*Section 6*
S628.020	Janet Whittington	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Build higher where vertical hills are the neighbouring property on the west or south side of the building	This would shade only the hill and not residential housing.	Reject	*Section 6*
S628.021	Janet Whittington	Residential Zones	Amend	Request that truly affordable housing be included in the PC29 such as secondary minor dwellings.	A Secondary Minor Dwelling (SMD), would not only cater for an increasing population, regardless of whether such statistical predictions are accurate, but primarily will provide truly affordable housing, especially for young growing families that otherwise find it impossible to get on the house ownership ladder. Affordable housing is noticeably absent from the plan. Please add into the plan the number and dollar value of affordable housing.	Accept	*Section 6*

S628.022	Janet Whittington	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Requests council] retain the existing regulations around daylight for those adversely effected by neighboring building heights and that the rules are strengthened to provide further protection for the residential public.	Solar power requires sunlight, not daylight. I am planning to put PV panels on my roof this year. Even at 3 stories, this plan change gives me no certainty of long term use of solar. Sunlight streaming through our windows is passive solar heating and makes me a happy soul. Without it, we pay for electric heating, and have a depressed soul. This is how lucrative it is for us: 2.4%/hour of sunlight on a $1m property with 8 hours of sunlight is worth: 2.4 x $1,000;000 x 8 = $192,000. With 2 hours of sunlight: $48,000. The difference is enough for a frugal person to retire on. I think letting those with profitable interests take that money off the residential public by depriving them of sunlight, is worth publicly discussing, and worth council consideration. Money is like energy it doesn't appear and disappear, It transfers from one medium to another or one pocket to another. This money is about winning and losing.	Reject	*Section 6*
S628.023	Janet Whittington	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Retain current 'daylight' and sunlight angles in residential properties and surrounding buildings.	Visit the Saturday market, notice the BNZ building backing onto the market is 3 stories high and look at the shade it casts. This would completely cover my property in autumn winter and spring. The hotel beside the BNZ where the alley connects Trafalgar with Montgomery Square is even higher.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS20.012	Tim Bayley		Support	Accept	The shade cast by a 6 story building has no place 1 m from anyone's northern boundary ... and NCC Planners even agreed because they now don't what them near their parks ...?	Reject	*Section 6*
S629.004	Samuel Nevin	Residential Zones	Amend	[Request] side facing windows at the first floor and above should be obscure glazed and non-opening up to at least 1.8m above finished floor level.	Side facing windows may invade privacy. Requiring them to be obscure glazed and non opening below approx. 1.8m will maintain neighbour privacy. I may have missed some provision along these lines in the plan.	Reject	*Section 6*

S629.006	Samuel Nevin	Residential Zones	Neutral	[Request] only if there is to be a significant reduction in the scope and spread of enabled development as the plan change progresses, then Council should look to still enable proportionately larger development on properties to the south of sites/streets and proportionately smaller for those to the north.	If the Council was minded to reduce the scope and spread of the proposed plan change due to various potential concerns that could be raised through submissions, then some form of intensification could and should still be enabled.	Reject	*Section 6*
S630.007	Ruby Hall	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S630.008	Ruby Hall	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S630.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S630.009	Ruby Hall	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words:The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S630.012	Ruby Hall	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*

S630.014	Ruby Hall	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S630.028	Ruby Hall	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property.	Refer to reasons in submission point S630.027.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S632.001	Fred Greig	Residential Zones	Not Stated	[Seeks] Council decide that in-fill housing be encouraged, provdied such houses are no more than two floors.	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S642.005	Moira Petersen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Seeks] existing residential areas to retain their current planning and zoning rules.	To prevent high rise buildings destroying neighborhoods and negatively impacting people's lives.	Reject	*Section 6*
S643.003	Rosemary Jones	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Seeks] NCC protect established properties rights to sunlight for optimum performance from solar panels and growing a vegetable garden. Sunlight is not enough.	I own a property on King Street in Nelson. I bought this property some years ago and enjoy my retirement and grown a veggie garden and walk to town. A quiet location and I now have a developer building a 40 unit social housing [building] on my northern boundary. In their opinion the effect on my property is 'less than minor' an insulting comment. To me this will have a major impact on my property. The current sunny aspect of my property will be changed.	Reject	*Section 6*
S645.002	Wayne and Jennifer Jackson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Retain a 1.5 m setback on the rear boundary of any new building and retain the current recession plane standards from the NRMP.	Refer to reasons in submission point S645.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S645.003	Wayne and Jennifer Jackson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Retain the current requirement for any variation to existing regulations to be subject to a Resource Consent application or at the very least to have to obtain the written consent of the owners of neighbouring properties.	Any person who requests a variation of the existing regulations has to apply for a Resource Consent. We believe that this requirement should continue to be necessary.	Reject	*Section 6*
S646.002	Angela Pattinson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Any resource consents required for breach of restricted discretionary activity must require written approval/consultation from neighbours.	Refer to reasons in submission point S646.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S647.007	Christopher Fitchett	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Require] any developer who wants to go outside the rules, no matter how small, to obtain a publicly notified resource consent.	With such significant changes being suggested, anything outside the new rules should have to go through a notified resource consent process, not simply approved by a staff member, i.e. when a six storied build has more than 3 units, which would be the case with most six storied buildings.	Reject	*Section 6*

S647.008	Christopher Fitchett	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain the provision to allow up to three units on any one property.	Refer to reasons in submission point S647.002.	Accept	*Section 6*
S649.002	Warren and Barbara Chippendale	Residential Zones	Oppose	Have considertaion for the residents to maintain their scenic views and shade free areas on the Tahunanui hillside.	Residents should not be in the position where a building removes their scenic view from their property. No resident should lose their sun by a building multi storeys high leaving their property in shaded/damp conditions. Council needs to protect all landowners (rate payers) and not to have a developer purchase land that takes away scenic views or sun.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS61.054	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- No resident should lose their sun by a building multi storeys high leaving their property in shaded/damp conditions. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- To retain the quality of mental, physical and social health of Tahunanui hillside residents.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS72.058	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- No resident should lose their sun by a building multi storeys high leaving their property in shaded/damp conditions. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- To retain the quality of mental, physical and social health of Tahunanui hillside residents.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS60.050	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- No resident should lose their sun by a building multi storeys high leaving their property in shaded/damp conditions. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- To retain the quality of mental, physical and social health of Tahunanui hillside residents.	Reject	*Section 6*

S650.002	Torlesse Trustees Limited for Dunstan Family Trust	Residential Zones	Amend	In conjunction with amendments to the relevant daylight admission rules, change policy RE2.3 to provide appropriate recognition of the impacts anticipated from intensification.	PC29 will fundamentally change the current bulk and location rules in the NRMP and yet PC29 does not proposed any significant change to policy RE2.5. It is considered that RE2.5 must also be amended as the bulk and location rules will lead to significant impacts on the building character and amenity of residential areas.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS48.001	Manuka Street Hospital Limited		Oppose	Reject in part	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Change to RE2.3. Torlesse Trustees Limited has submitted that a change is required to RE2.3 "to provide appropriate recognition of the impacts anticipated from intensification". Manuka Street Hospital Limited opposes this submission because the notified version of this policy already seeks to ensure buildings minimise shading effects and allow for the admission of daylight. No further changes are required to the policy, and it is unclear on what changes are sought by the submitter. In light of the new daylight and sunlight controls, some consequential amendments may be appropriate to the explanation and reasons for the policy.	Accept	*Section 6*
S652.003	Graeme Tyree	Residential Zones	Support	Support proposal to have three dwellings per title "as of right" without a resource consent.	I am strongly in favour of the proposal to have three dwellings per title "as of right" without a resource consent. This is a key method of allowing increased density. By partitioning existing three- or four-bedroom houses into two dwellings, some more intensification can be achieved without needing more infrastructure.	Accept	*Section 6*
S652.005	Graeme Tyree	Residential Zones	Amend	[Amend recession planes] to keep the current daylight [angles] over southern boundaries, but allow building up to northern boundaries at two storeys high and with a 45 degree recession plane, i.e. five metres up and 45 degrees in above that height. Additionally, once a redevelopment has built on their norther side up to two storeys to a southern boundary, the	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

S652.006	Graeme Tyree	Residential Zones	Amend	Site coverage rules shoudl be changed to allow building coverage of 55% in all zones. An increase in permeable landscape areas would be appropriate and also help with rainwater	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S658.001	Adam Hills	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S658.002	Adam Hills	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S658.003	Adam Hills	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S659.001	Lauran Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S659.002	Lauran Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S659.003	Lauran Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S660.001	Anna Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S660.002	Anna Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S660.003	Anna Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S661.001	Jasmine Smythe-Ross	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S661.002	Jasmine Smythe-Ross	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S661.003	Jasmine Smythe-Ross	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S662.001	Joe Caponte	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S662.002	Joe Caponte	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S662.003	Joe Caponte	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S663.001	Peter Smillie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S663.002	Peter Smillie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S663.003	Peter Smillie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S664.001	Rachel Duke	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S664.002	Rachel Duke	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S664.003	Rachel Duke	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S665.001	Marianne Palmer	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S665.002	Marianne Palmer	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S665.003	Marianne Palmer	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S665.016	Marianne Palmer	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S665.017	Marianne Palmer	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S665.016.	Accept	*Section 6*
S665.018	Marianne Palmer	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S665.022	Marianne Palmer	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S665.024	Marianne Palmer	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*

S665.038	Marianne Palmer	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S665.037.	Reject	*Section 13 of Overview Report*
S666.001	Graeme Cowan	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S666.002	Graeme Cowan	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S666.003	Graeme Cowan	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S667.001	Ian Lash	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S667.002	Ian Lash	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S667.003	Ian Lash	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S669.001	Stuart Mayer	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S669.002	Stuart Mayer	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S669.003	Stuart Mayer	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S669.009	Stuart Mayer	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Seek] to make new subdivisions higher density, that way people buying them will know what they are getting into.	I purchased my house in this area in part because there are not multi storey, dense housing and it is quiet. Allowing high density (or medium) will ruin enjoyment of properties next door due to loss of sunlight.	Reject	*Section 6*
S669.010	Stuart Mayer	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Seek] to make new subdivisions higher density, that way people buyingthem will know what they are getting into.	I purchased my house in this area in part because there are not multi storey, dense housing and it is quiet. Allowing high density (or medium) will ruin enjoyment of properties next door due to loss of sunlight.	Reject	*Section 6*
S670.001	Mark Riley and Juliette Barrett	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S670.002	Mark Riley and Juliette Barrett	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S670.003	Mark Riley and Juliette Barrett	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S671.001	Ron van der Lem	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S671.002	Ron van der Lem	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S671.003	Ron van der Lem	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S672.001	Hilary van der Lem	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S672.002	Hilary van der Lem	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S672.003	Hilary van der Lem	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S672.012	Hilary van der Lem	Residential Zones	Oppose	Lower [proposed building] heights to a reasonable level. Keep the higher levels to the likes of St Vincent St and relocate the businesses that are currently there	Existing homes need their sunshine.	Reject	*Section 6*
S672.013	Hilary van der Lem	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Lower [proposed building] heights to a reasonable level. Keep the higher levels to the likes of St Vincent St and relocate the businesses that are currently there	Existing homes need their sunshine.	Reject	*Section 6*
S673.001	Craig Helm	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres. Be practical with boundary offsets.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S673.002	Craig Helm	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres. Be practical with boundary offsets.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S673.003	Craig Helm	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres. Be practical with boundary offsets.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S674.001	Ray and June Austin	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S674.002	Ray and June Austin	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S674.003	Ray and June Austin	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S674.010	Ray and June Austin	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Utilise existing vacant houses].	Utilise Kainga Ora vacant houses, one in Kaka St. Examiner St? Whareama could have been used over winter.	Reject	*Section 6*
S675.001	Margaret Meechang	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. Houses with solar panels should be unshaded by new buildings.	Reject	Section 6
S675.002	Margaret Meechang	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. Houses with solar panels should be unshaded by new buildings.	Reject	Section 6
S675.003	Margaret Meechang	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. Houses with solar panels should be unshaded by new buildings.	Reject	Section 6
S675.010	Margaret Meechang	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules to require] all buildings with more than one level [to] have access to floors above suitable for all levels of ability (i.e. lifts).	All buildings with more than one level should have an access to floors above suitable for all levels of ability (i.e. lifts).	Reject	*Section 6*

S675.020	Margaret Meechang	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S675.021	Margaret Meechang	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S675.020.	Accept	*Section 6*
S675.022	Margaret Meechang	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S675.025	Margaret Meechang	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S675.027	Margaret Meechang	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S675.041	Margaret Meechang	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S675.040.	Reject	*Section 6*

S676.001	R. Sherrill	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S676.002	R. Sherrill	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S676.003	R. Sherrill	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S677.001	Justin Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S677.002	Justin Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S677.003	Justin Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S677.009	Justin Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules to ensure] existing propert[ies] keep a minimum of two hours direct sunlight in the middle of winter.	Existing property to keep a minimum of two hours direct sunlight in the middle of winter. Daylight sunshine hours should be protected at all costs.	Reject	*Section 6*
S677.010	Justin Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules so] units look like houses with mixed 1, 2, and 3 bedrooms, only up to two storeys with conditions for sunlight for neighbouring property in residential zones.	Existing privacy to be kept [to protect] mental health [and] well-being. Existing property to keep a minimum of two hours direct sunlight in the middle of winter. Daylight sunshine hours should be protected at all costs.	Reject	*Section 6*

S677.011	Justin Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules so] units look like houses with mixed 1, 2, and 3 bedrooms, only up to two storeys with conditions for sunlight for neighbouring property in residential zones.	Existing privacy to be kept [to protect] mental health [and] well-being. Existing property to keep a minimum of two hours direct sunlight in the middle of winter. Daylight sunshine hours should be protected at all costs.	Reject	*Section 6*
S677.017	Justin Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Seek to] allow existing residential owners to build a small flat on their property.	Not stated.	Accept	*Section 6*
S677.018	Justin Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	Consult with affected neighbours on social housing and intensification in residential areas.	Will affect property values.	Reject	*Section 6*
S678.001	Angela Clark	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S678.002	Angela Clark	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S678.003	Angela Clark	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S678.009	Angela Clark	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules so that] each unit should be 2-3 bedroom with off street parking, no more than 2 storeys high, 1.5 metres off the boundary, require 2 hours direct sunlight in the middle of winter, and consideration should be given to	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S679.001	Helena Barrow	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S679.002	Helena Barrow	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S679.003	Helena Barrow	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S680.001	Pamela Ferguson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S680.002	Pamela Ferguson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S680.003	Pamela Ferguson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S681.001	Michael Curnow	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S681.002	Michael Curnow	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S681.003	Michael Curnow	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S682.001	Neil Hickling	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S682.002	Neil Hickling	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S682.003	Neil Hickling	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S683.001	Helen and David Murphy	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S683.002	Helen and David Murphy	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S683.003	Helen and David Murphy	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S684.007	Edward Short	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S684.008	Edward Short	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S684.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S684.009	Edward Short	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S684.012	Edward Short	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S684.014	Edward Short	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S684.028	Edward Short	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S684.027.	Reject	*Section 6*

S685.007	Helen Winwood	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S685.008	Helen Winwood	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S685.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S685.009	Helen Winwood	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S685.012	Helen Winwood	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S685.014	Helen Winwood	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S685.028	Helen Winwood	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S685.027.	Reject	*Section 6*

S686.007	Christopher Knox	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S686.008	Christopher Knox	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S686.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S686.009	Christopher Knox	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S686.012	Christopher Knox	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S686.014	Christopher Knox	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S686.028	Christopher Knox	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S686.027.	Reject	*Section 6*

S687.007	Judith Bartsch	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S687.008	Judith Bartsch	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S687.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S687.009	Judith Bartsch	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S687.012	Judith Bartsch	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S687.014	Judith Bartsch	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S687.028	Judith Bartsch	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S687.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S690.005	Rosemary and John Bealing	Residential Zones	Oppose	Sort out the confusion created by using the terminology "daylight" angles, where "sunlight" angles are what is important	All windows will pass "daylight", but only those not in shadow will pass "sunlight".	Reject	*Section 6*

S690.006	Rosemary and John Bealing	Residential Zones	Oppose	All neighbours that will be significantly affected by proposed changes should have to give their written approval before any new [resource and] building consents are approved by Council.	We understand the need to allow for new people to move to our "great little city", but we do feel that our elected representatives should be first-looking after the existing ratepayers (in our case, for more than 40 years at this address), ahead of new ratepayers. We get the impression that NCC are thumbing their nose at current ratepayers.	Reject	*Section 6*
S691.002	John Walker	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Oppose building heights that do not] provide daylight for solar power and veggie gardens.	Height is going to affect daylight to other properties.	Reject	*Section 6*
S691.005	John Walker	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Residential building heights should be a maximum of 3 levels and require resource consent.	The CBD commercial area is suitable for six levels, not the residential areas which should be a maximum of 3 levels, but on application which will require resource consent.	Reject	*Section 6*
S693.003	Peregrine Hoby	Residential Zones	Oppose	Require resource consent for new development [inferred].	If PC 29 were to be implemented developers would have carte blanche, which is my experience, they would take full advantage of, to the detriment of adjoining properties. Developers must seek consent!	Reject	*Section 6*
S694.002	Glenys MacLellan	Residential Zones	Amend	Create mixed-use developments with retail on the ground floor and living above.	I think the concept of zoning with the separation of commercial (shops & offices) and residential activities is flawed and a barrier to building denser cities. Using the traditional style of the shop at the ground with 2 or 3 levels of homes above, around the marketplace or other public areas (preferably with trees and gardens) is one that works much better for people than stand-alone large complexes not connected to anything. Meeting places here are everywhere and communities naturally build from their residents.	Reject	*Section 6*
S694.006	Glenys MacLellan	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Require] multi-household and/or multi-level housing to have noise mitigation built-in.	All multi-household and/or multi-level housing needs to have really good noise mitigation built-in, or they do not work for residents. In the past 15 years, my village has occasionally had major noise issues, regular calls to NCC to complain, unneighborly angst etc. It may be that people need advice on how to live on top of each other.	Reject	*Section 6*

S694.007	Glenys MacLellan	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Require] all housing to have areas of permeable ground adjacent to them.	Hopefully, there will soon be less need for so many roads of 2 way and a lot more lanes so walking becomes the norm for most people. Impermeable surfaces cause lots of runoff from rain and carry pollutants into the stormwater system. Rethinking what is done with rainwater has to happen and soon. Nelson's CBD has very little permeable land, more is needed and should be part of all developments.	Accept	*Section 6*
S696.001	John Munting	Residential Zones	Amend	Provide a better understanding of what is reasonable and acceptable to an established residential area.	The Nelson City Council proposal have significant limitations and assumptions. My Prime area of concern is the proposed designated six storey block between the top of Mount Street and Hampden Street. Yes we need provision for more affordable housing. However such housing excludes multi-story construction and with costs aggravated by Hillside location and accessed by limited narrow substandard streets. You may end up with the site units being only affordable to the wealthy and used as holiday accommodation and serving no real purpose to provide for the less wealthy. Where a resource consent is not required will only create uncertainty to those who may be affected eg. will their properties become devalued and if so will the Nelson City Council pay out compensation.	Reject	*Section 6*
S696.003	John Munting	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Revise side yards [Rules REr.17E, 18E and 19E].	To be meaningful in actually achieving and retaining direct sunlight to neighbouring properties.	Reject	*Section 6*
S696.004	John Munting	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Revise front yards [Rules REr.17D, 18D and 19D].	Revise front yards to be meaningful in actually achieving and retaining direct sunlight to neighbouring properties.	Reject	*Section 6*
S696.005	John Munting	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Revise daylight provisions [Rules REr.17K, 18K and 19K].	Revised daylight provision to be meaningful in actually achieving and retaining direct sunlight to neighbouring properties.	Reject	*Section 6*

S698.004	Margaret Muir	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Require mandatory resource consent for any proposed high-density buildings. Any affected person (or concerned resident) should have the right to object to the proposal and have their concerns heard.	The proposal that resource consent is not required to build such tower blocks is misguided and overly disadvantageous to those affected in such buildings. Residents need to feel confident their concerns are heard and respected and have equal weight as builders and developers. Resource consent must also be mandatory for any such housing development, and any effected residents or businesses should have the right to oppose any such structures, that would negatively affect them, and be fairly heard.	Reject	*Section 6*
S699.001	James and Bridget Austin	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Request] a different approach which maintains access to the sun, ensures extensive green spaces, and minimises adverse effects on existing property owners.	We support the principal of intensification but consider the details of Plan Change 29 are unacceptable as they ignore the basic advantages of Nelson.	Reject	*Section 6*
S699.003	James and Bridget Austin	Residential Zones	Amend	Increase the number of dwelling units from 3 per site in PC 29 to one per 100 square metres of section	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S699.004	James and Bridget Austin	Residential Zones	Amend	[Amend the building height rules to allow] any new building to have one extra storey to the building it replaces. If agreement of adjoining property owners is obtained, two extra storeys	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S699.005	James and Bridget Austin	Residential Zones	Amend	[Amend the] height to side boundaries to be no more than 5.5m for two storey and 8m for three storey buildings. Recession plane for balance of building 25 degrees	PC29 heights of 3m per storey is excessive.	Reject	*Section 6*
S699.006	James and Bridget Austin	Residential Zones	Amend	[Amend] site coverage with buildings not to exceed 50% and maximum site coverage for vehicle accessible area and buildings not to exceed 60%	To allow for greenery.	Reject	*Section 6*
S699.007	James and Bridget Austin	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend yard set backs to have a greater set back in the rear for resident garden.	Building to side boundaries should be encouraged. Set back from rear should be greater than set back from the front. This should give more garden area to residents.	Reject	*Section 6*
S699.008	James and Bridget Austin	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend the rules for fencing and walls to have a maximum height of 1m along the front boundary and 1.2m along the side and rear boundaries, unless the adjoining property owner agrees. However, trees and hedges can be higher than	To encourage green space.	Reject	*Section 6*

S700.004	Susan Hamilton	Residential Zones	Oppose	Reinstatement of the NRMP objective and policies required for the current Lower Density Residential Zone for all proposed residential zones.	Council's consideration of current resource consents applications in the Lower Density Area reviews the potential for adverse visual and physical dominance effects. What PC 29 proposes will have substantial visual and physical dominance effects and not retain the streetscape and residential amenity of the wider environment. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S700.007	Susan Hamilton	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain existing NRMP AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following potential effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes. Shadowing of green initiatives such as solar panels and passive solar energy heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Property owners reluctance to invest in developing new (low rise) infill on their section [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S700.008	Susan Hamilton	Residential Zones	Oppose	Include the NRMP existing Daylight and Sunlight policy statement RE2.3.i.	Refer to reasons in submission point S700.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S700.009	Susan Hamilton	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S700.011	Susan Hamilton	Residential Zones	Amend	Create a General Residential Zone that includes the remaining areas with the NRMP current rules and allow for 3 units intensification up to two storeys on some adequately sized	Refer to reasons in submission point S700.010.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS28.143	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Create a General Residential Zone that includes the remaining areas with the NRMP current rules and allow for 3 units intensification up to two storeys on some adequately sized sites. The Tahunanui (flat) and Monaco residential areas are largely outside the PC29 boundaries and comprise either standard residential or low-density zoning. Applying a general residential or intensification zoning across all existing residential zones would provide for residential intensification as a permitted activity. There are a number of areas that are not appropriate for further residential intensification, in particular those areas subject to the Nelson Airport Overlays.	Accept	*Section 6*
S700.021	Susan Hamilton	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Require] Council work more closely with agencies e.g. Kainga Ora, NZ Police and other social services to develop more fit for purpose interventions for antisocial behaviour that affects an existing neighbour's enjoyment of	Refer to reasons in submission point S700.020.	Reject	*Section 6*
S701.004	David MacDonald and Susan Hamilton	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Create a General Residential Zone that includes the remaining areas with the NRMP current rules and allow for 3 unit intensification up to two storeys on some adequately sized sites.	There will be specific sites throughout the City where effects can be mitigated and where higher buildings can be accommodated and developed following resource consent approval with the opportunity for any affected parties to make submissions. This is all about Council managing the development of the City (one of its core tasks), not passing the initiative to other parties, and therefore minimising unintended or unacceptable consequences.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS28.144	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Create a General Residential Zone that includes the remaining areas with the NRMP current rules and allow for 3 unit intensification up to two storeys on some adequately sized sites. The Tahunanui (flat) and Monaco residential areas are largely outside the PC29 boundaries and comprise either standard residential or low-density zoning. Applying a general residential or intensification zoning across all existing residential zones would provide for residential intensification as a permitted activity. However, there are a number of areas that are not appropriate for further residential intensification, in particular those areas subject to the Nelson Airport Overlays.	Accept	*Section 6*

S702.002	Mark Pattinson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules for all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval.	I strongly oppose changes to daylight angles/recession planes, and boundary adjustments in the general residential zones. My wife and I proceeded with our build in 2013 safe in the knowledge that the current rules including recession planes, sunshine and daylight hours would not have any negative effect on our surrounding neighbours, and that any future development would afford us the same protections. I feel that a blanket approach is not wise given the completely different land contours within the suggested zones. Furthermore, properties on a back section have an added disadvantage in relation to daylight angles/recession planes due to development in front. Should the proposed plan changes be implemented our current daylight hours and recession planes could be grossly diminished causing loss of quality of living, loss of value to our property and negative impact to our mental health, restricted light for solar energy for natural heating via windows, and to vegetable gardens. These effects are life changing to a cohesive neighbourhood that will inevitably create division amongst residents.	Reject	*Section 6*
S702.003	Mark Pattinson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Any resource consents required for breach of restricted discretionary activity must require written approval from neighbours	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S702.005	Mark Pattinson	Residential Zones	Support	Allow any future development under the existing regulations.	The parcel of substantial land on the north west boundary of our property (104D Princes Drive) and several other properties in the area can and should be developed within the current regulations.	Reject	*Section 6*

S703.004	Mike Hawes	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that the impacts [as listed in the reasons] are addressed through tighter rules and compulsory standards, rather than left to the discretion of developers.	Whilst adding the cost of building these considerations are critical not just for the current communities but for the future. Many of these impacts can be reduced if design and execution are done well. Impacts on neighbours and residents of high-rise buildings. I have concerns about the range of impacts that could occur from potentially poorly executed high-rise development, not only on those who live nearby but also those who will live within such buildings. - Land values - Loss of sunlight - Parking - Green space - E-charging - Social implications and quality of life [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S704.002	Mark Pattinson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules for all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval.	I strongly oppose changes to daylight angles/recession planes, and boundary adjustments in the general residential zones. My wife and I purchased this property in 2016 safe in the knowledge that the current rules including recession planes, sunshine and daylight hours, and boundaries would protect us against any future development in the area. I feel that a blanket approach is not wise due to the diversity within the suggested zones. Furthermore, properties on a back section have an added disadvantage in relation to daylight angles/recession planes due to development in front. Should the proposed plan changes be implemented our current daylight hours and recession planes could be grossly diminished causing loss of quality of living, loss of value to our property and negative impact to our mental health, restricted light for solar energy and to vegetable gardens. These effects are life changing to a cohesive neighbourhood that will inevitably create division amongst residents.	Reject	*Section 6*
S704.003	Mark Pattinson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Request that] any resource consents required for breach of restricted discretionary activity must require written approval from neighbours	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

S708.007	Harry Pearson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their homes. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. Reduction in the ability for people to grow their own food. [In addition], hill properties already have shading issues directly from the hill which is another reason for not having high density development on hills. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S708.008	Harry Pearson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S708.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S708.009	Harry Pearson	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S708.012	Harry Pearson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley, Tasman Heights, Marsden Valley, and Bayview in Atawhai.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S708.014	Harry Pearson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*

S708.028	Harry Pearson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S708.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S708.047	Harry Pearson	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Opposed to new greenfield developments being used for only single storey dwellings.	This is a complete underutilization of land that can accommodate increased intensification without affecting existing suburbs. The inner city should be the starting place for the most significant intensification before moving onto existing residential neighborhoods.	Reject	*Section 6*
S709.005	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Add a definition of "Public health" as follows:Public health - means the health of:(a) all the people of New Zealand; or(b) a population group, community, or section of people within New Zealand.	Additional definitions of public health and wellbeing are recommended for clarity. The National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD) mentions wellbeing and health in Objective 1: New Zealand has well-functioning urban environments that enable all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future. Public health as defined in The Pae Ora Act Pae Ora (Healthy Futures) Act 2022 No 30 (as at 27 July 2023)... Removing physical and mental health and instead including health and wellbeing provides for a more holistic, all-encompassing definition. This is important when considering te ao Māori (the Māori world) view(s) of hauora (health and wellbeing) which includes wairua (spiritual). This is important to consider when considering facilities under 'health facilities' such as kaupapa Māori services providing rongoā Māori (Māori medicine). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S709.006	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Add a definition of "wellbeing" as follows: Well-being - means the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of people and communities, and includes their health and safety.	Wellbeing as defined in The Natural and Built Environment Act (NBA) Natural and Built Environment Act 2023 No 46 [now repealed]. Refer to reasons in submission point S709.005 and the original submission for more detail.	Reject	*Section 6*

S709.008	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Amend	Add a definition of "daylight" as follows:Daylight - daylight consists of skylight (diffuse light from the sky) and sunlight (direct beam radiation	Add a definition for daylight to improve understanding. Suggested definition taken from the Auckland Design Manual.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS56.089	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought. Daylight and public open space are common and easily understood terms and definitions are not required. Kāinga Ora also consider the definitions proposed are not accurate.	Accept	*Section 6*
S709.009	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Add a definition of "Public Open Space" as follows:Public open space - any area that includes public parks and planted areas, waterways and streets that can be used for recreation or public health benefit, or to help protect the	Noted Open Space is not defined. Christchurch city council (CCC) define public open space which includes public health benefit.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS56.090	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought. Daylight and public open space are common and easily understood terms and definitions are not required. Kāinga Ora also consider the definitions proposed are not accurate.	Accept	*Section 6*
S709.010	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend AD8.2.ii. d [Resource consents, Information to be included with applications] to include the following addition:viii. Public health and wellbeing Details outlining how this plan and its outcomes will positively contribute to the health and wellbeing of current and future generations through identifying determinants of health such as; access of sunlight entering the building and outdoor space, access to open green space, privacy,	Refer to the reasons in Appendix A2 of the original submission for more detail.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS56.091	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora does not support such onerous application requirements.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS56.111	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora opposes this addition as it is likely to be too restrictive and the existing rule framework will ensure an acceptable standard of amenity.	Accept	*Section 6*

S709.013	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Amend	Consider amending AD8.2.iv and v to include reference to the Urban Design Panel and the design guidance in Appendix 22 Guidelines for comprehensive housing development.	It is critical that applications are consistency assessed by qualified expertise to achieve a well-functioning urban environment. This provision is particularly important especially when considering staff turnover. NPHS-NM see the Urban Design Panel as a tool to achieve positive design outcomes that benefit public health. The use of the design guidelines could help inform better design outcomes as well as provide a benchmark against which projects could be reviewed.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS56.112	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora opposes this addition as it is likely to be too restrictive and the existing policy will ensure an acceptable standard of amenity. The existing drafting of the policy is supported to the extent that it is consistent with the primary submission of Kāinga Ora.	Accept	*Section 6*
S709.016	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Support the retention of the provisions relating to the Conservation Overlay as notified.	Refer to reasons in submission point S709.015.	Accept	*Section 6*
S709.043	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend the Urban Design opening statement DO13A.i as follows: Issues relevant to quality urban design are discussed in Chapter 4. Development and re-development activities in the urban area have potential to adversely affect the quality, functioning and sustainability of the urban environment. The design of and relationships between buildings, spaces and networks (e.g. streets) has a significant influence on the health and wellbeing of people. Quality of everyday life is affected by the environments we share in the urban areas. ... High quality urban design can also help avoid some of the problems of poorly designed developments which have resulted in adverse effects such as traffic congestion, unsustainable energy use, inefficient use of urban infrastructure, lack of distinctive identity, social and cultural isolation	High quality urban design can improve public health when urban planning is focused around the needs of the most vulnerable groups in society such as people with disabilities, children and those suffering from economic hardship. Suggest additional wording to highlight the downstream impact of urban design on the health and wellbeing of people. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S709.044	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support	Approve policy DO13A.1.1 local context ad environment as notified.	Support addition 'while being future-focussed'. It is important that decisions are made with a long-term view and consider the impact on the wellbeing of future generations. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S709.045	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend the last sentence of DO13A.1.1.i as follows: ...Therefore in the consent assessment process, consideration needs to be wider than just the effect on the individual site or sites, and include the effect on the health and wellbeing of people, to	Refer to the reasons in submission point S709.043.	Reject	*Section 6*
S709.046	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend DO13A.2.i and DO13A.2.2 to align with local biodiversity strategies as follows: DO13A.2.i Good connections - ki uta ki tai - enhance biodiversity, choice, support social cohesion, make places lively and safe, and facilitate contact among people. Reduced travel times and lower environmental impacts occur in places with good connections between activities and natural environments, and the careful placement of facilities. Where physical layouts and activity patterns are easily understood, residents and visitors can navigate around the area easily. DO13A.2.2 Subdivision and development should provide for the enhancement, restoration and, where appropriate, multiple use of natural environment connections.	Maintaining a connection of the natural world from ki uta ki tai (mountains to sea), not only maintains and enhances native biodiversity but also has a positive impact on wellbeing. Access to natural spaces in the city, improve air filtration, liveability and may rehabilitate ancestral land through native plants. The additional wording strengthens alignment to the vision of Project Mahitahi: The Mauri (or life force) of the Mahitahi is restored- ki uta ki tai - so that native plants and wildlife can thrive within a functioning and connected eco-system and people and communities are inspired to nurture and value the Mahitahi as a taonga for past, present, and future generations. Including the Nelson Biodiversity Strategy in this section is important. And, whilst the Nelson Biodiversity Strategy, to our knowledge, has not been reviewed to align with the national Policy Statement - Indigenous Biodiversity (NPSIB), this should be included as well. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S709.047	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend policy DO13A.2.1 as follows: Accessibility is maximised through subdivision and development design which provides for: a. safe and pleasant transport networks for all modes of movement, including pedestrians, micromobility, cyclists, public transport and motor vehicles. b. a variety of logical and effective connections between different transport networks and between different parts of the city and urban areas. And consequently remove the note from the last sentence of the	Include 'micromobility' and remove the note to be consistent with other sections of the plan.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S709.048	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend DO13A.3.i, and DO13A.3.1 to strengthen these provisions as follows: DO13A.3.i High quality public spaces enable people to play, relax and socialise throughout various levels/scales of the urban environment (suburbs, commercial villages, city centre), support recreational and commercial activity, and help to ensure vitality of public spaces and communities. Conversely, poor quality public spaces are an inefficient use of resources, are under-utilised and are a burden on ratepayers. Public spaces need to be co-designed with their neighbouring community to ensure the spaces meet their needs. DO13A.3.1 c.c. the public space to have a variety of distinctive spaces appropriate to the context	Public spaces that are codesigned with their neighbouring communities are more likely to be utilised. Additional wording suggested to strengthen this provision. As the urban environment intensifies and there is less room for gardens on individual sections, it is important that public spaces provide opportunities for people to garden. Participation in gardening enables integration within communities which can have a follow-on effect on cultural cohesion and a reduction in inequalities.	Reject	*Section 6*
S709.049	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend Policy DO13A.3.3, Policy DO13A.6.3 and DO13A.6.3.i to specifically encourage or require that prominent and public buildings and spaces or significant projects are developed with the relevant communities, through a co-design process with the community.	Achieving a well-functioning urban environment that meets the needs of current and future generations requires a co-design approach with the community. Refer to reasons in submission point S709.048 and the original submission for more detail.	Reject	*Section 6*

S709.050	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	• Amend the policies and provisions supporting objective DO13A.6 urban design process to strongly encourage the use of an Urban Design Panel to review, assess, approve and provide design advice on all private and public projects. Specific provisions mentioned include: Retain provision DO13A.3.1.iv Amend DO13A.3.2.ii Amend DO13A.3.1.iii	NPHS-NM opposes the removal of the NCC Urban Design Panel from this section as the Urban Design Panel is a critical to ensuring designs result in quality public spaces that are beautiful and inspiring, provide for and enable social, cultural, economic and environmental wellbeing and enhance amenity values.	Reject	*Section 6*
S709.052	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend Policy DO13A.4.1 Flexibility, choices and adaptability. and add to the associated methods as follows: DO13A.4.1 Subdivision and development facilitate, where appropriate:a. ... b. ... c. ... d. ... e. developments that enable as many people as possible, including disabled people, to independently use and interact with the onsite living environments.DO13A.4.1.xi Ensure developments align to to Access Standard NZS 4121:2001.	All people deserve to live in a built environment that meets their needs. There is an opportunity to build community by ensuring that buildings, and their surrounding infrastructure, are accessible for all. Designing and building for the needs of disabled people/tangata whaikaha is not just about having an accessible home, it's also about having accessible communities. An accessible building is one which people with disabilities can use in the same way as anyone else. An accessible building must be considered in the context of an accessible journey encompassing the route to the building (approachability), the route through the building (accessibility) and the facilities within the building (usability). The advantages of an accessible building apply to the population as a whole and not just those with disabilities. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS56.098	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Plan rules should not duplicate other standards including those within separate nationwide standards or the Building Code.	Accept	*Section 6*
S709.053	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend objective DO13A.5 Sustainable places & communities as follows: Urban development that supports a well-functioning urban environment and meets the community's current needs ~~without compromising~~	NPHS-NM supports additional wording and suggests positive framing to strengthen wording. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S709.055	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Support policy DO13A.5.1 environmentally responsive, and request that the Council website is updated to provide associated guidance on the Eco Building Design advisor, solar water heating and rainwater harvesting	Noted there was no content on NCC's website under 'Sustainable living ideas' - 'eco building design advisor' and - 'solar water heating' Eco Building Design Adviser.	Accept	*Section 6*

S709.056	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Consider adding an indicator to DO13Ae environmental results anticipated and performance indicators.Number of housing modifications required in the Nelson region. Data source: Te Whatu Ora.	Recommend adding indicators to monitor how well the urban development is meeting the needs of the disabled community. For example, housing modifications are required when a house doesn't meet the needs of the residents. Monitoring the number of housing modifications overtime could support evaluation. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	*Section 6*
S709.057	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Subdivision	Support in part	Amend district wide objective DO14.2 amenity values as follows: The amenity values of the built environment are improved for future generations through the subdivision and development processes that achieve all of the following: a) Compact and vibrant centres and neighbourhoods, and b) Safe and attractive streets, and public open spaces, and c) Diversity of housing choices across the city (accessible and affordable), and d) Quality living environments for	Enhancement of ecological, recreational, cultural, community and amenity values are required to meet the wellbeing needs of future generations. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S709.059	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Subdivision	Support in part	Amend district wide objective DO15.1 Urban form as follows: An urban form that supports a well-functioning urban environment in which intensive development is not detached from consolidated within existing urban zone boundaries and which enhances ~~avoids or mitigates adverse effects on~~ ecological, recreational, cultural, community and amenity values.	District wide objective DO15.1 Urban form Support in part Avoiding or mitigating implies the maintenance of the status quo which is not adequate as seen in the decline in wellbeing of communities, health outcomes, environmental degradation and increase in climate related events. Enhancement of ecological, recreational, cultural, community and amenity values is required to meet the wellbeing needs of future generations.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS25.022	Port Nelson LTD		Oppose	Reject	PNL opposes the proposed drafting as 'enhances' is inconsistent with the language used throughout the RMA, i.e. avoiding or mitigating adverse effects.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS56.099	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought. The term 'enhances' is inconsistent with the effects tests within the RMA and is too subjective and open to interpretation.	Accept	*Section 6*

S709.060	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend District wide explanation DO16.1.1.ii [and associated Residential Zone explanation RE1.6.i] as follows: The primary goal of the General Residential Zone is to provide the opportunity for residential accommodation within a suburban setting. The zone enables a range of housing types, including detached and attached residential units, accessible housing and achieves a suburban residential character by generally limiting the scale and form of buildings to two storeys and requiring usable and accessible on site landscaped areas and private open space.	All people deserve to live in a built environment that meets their needs. There is an opportunity to build community by ensuring that buildings, and their surrounding infrastructure, are accessible for all. Designing and building for the needs of disabled people/tangata whaikaha is not just about having an accessible home, it's also about having accessible communities. An accessible building is one which people with disabilities can use in the same way as anyone else. All people deserve to be able to and feel safe to visit the homes of their friends and whānau, access the local shops and parks and attend hospital or healthcare appointments. As it stands, parts of the built environment segregates disabled people by having inaccessible infrastructure. Urban design that takes disabled people's needs into consideration can play a key role in fixing this. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S709.065	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend District wide explanations DO16.1.1.v, DO16.1.1.vi and DO16.1.1.vii [and consequential amendments to associated Residential Zone explanations RE.1.2A i, RE1.4.i and RE1.5.i] to acknowledge that natural hazard risk management is for current and future generations as follows: ...This zone maintains the opportunity for residential accommodation within a suburban setting, while acknowledging that the area is at risk from natural hazards including sea level rise due to climate change. This zone manages that risk (for current and future generations) with development specific assessment through the resource consent process...	Climate change is an example of how health, disease and overall wellbeing is influenced by a wide range of factors which lie beyond the health sector. Efforts to mitigate the effects of climate change will produce health co-benefits at a population level, such as reductions in heart disease, cancer, obesity, type 2 diabetes, respiratory disease, motor vehicle injuries and improvements in mental health. Climate change is already happening in New Zealand and could have a profound impact on future generations of New Zealanders. While climate change affects everyone, those who have contributed the least to the crisis - children, those in poverty, and future generations, are the most affected. [Refer to the original submission and Appendix A2.6 for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S709.066	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend REd.5 residential description, to broaden the scope of health-related services to include "health care facilities and pharmacies" [as it relates to non residential activities in the residential zone]. Suggested wording as follows: "These activities tend to provide essential community services including convenience shops, churches, schools, ~~doctors' surgeries~~ health care facilities and pharmacies, day care centres, and public halls. In some residential areas, activities such as	Reword to broaden the scope of health-related services to include "health care facilities and pharmacies." This supports thinking about a more holistic view than limiting services to just doctors' surgeries. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	*Section 6*
S709.067	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Consider [including] the Key Determinant's of Health in the Built Environment in the provisions relating to high quality living environments and residential amenity.	Consider the Key Determinant's of Health in the Built Environment in the rules to support individual and community wellbeing. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S709.068	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	• [Consider amending/ strengthening the relevant Residential Zone provisions to ensure] that "Sunlight" is considered in the rules to support individual and community wellbeing. [Relevant provisions listed in the submission to be amended include]: REr.17B.4 Residential units Assessment Criteria, REr.17J.5 Maximum Building Height Assessment Criteria and Explanation, REr.18B.4 Residential units Assessment Criteria, REr.18F.4 Outdoor living court Assessment Criteria.	Support in part RE2.3 Daylight and sunlight. It is important to note areas that require careful consideration. For example, parts of Washington Valley that get limited sunlight in winter, footpaths and roads that are in areas of Whakatū/Nelson which slopes are shaded and steep, can frost over and become a hazard for all road users. And footpaths around older adult populations, such as retirement villages need to meet their needs e.g. wide, level, flat surface. It is therefore important to ensure provisions ensure development designs that mitigate this - such as providing level surfaces where able. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS56.156	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support	Reject	Kainga Ora considers the rules and matters of discretion appropriately deal with amenity effects to provide for a sufficient standard of amenity to the extent that this it is consistent with the primary submission of Kāinga Ora. The assessment criteria REr.17B.4 (residential units) already references sunlight access in two places.	Accept	*Section 6*

S709.069	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support	Approve the REr.17A.5 REr.17A.6 General Residential Zone Assessment Criteria and Explanations for residential activities.	Support assessing [residential activities] for the resilience of the services to the likely effects of climate change. Support the inclusion of 'wellbeing and communities' in the explanation. [Refer to the original submission and Appendix A2 for more detail]	Accept	*Section 6*
S709.070	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Consider amending rules REr.17B.3, REr.18B.3 and REr.19B.3 to increase the number of accessible units required in a restricted discretionary residential development of more than 10 units from 10% to 30%. In addition, make amendments to the guidance on how to calculate the number of accessible units as follows: b. where the assessment of the number of accessible units results in a fractional number, any fraction under one-half shall be ~~disregarded~~ rounded up to one and fractions of one-half or greater shall be rounded up to the nearest whole ~~considered as one residential unit~~.	NPHS-NM supports Council in highlighting Universal design in Section 32 Evaluation Report. In response to this, the proposed plan requires applications for 10 or more residential units, to have at least 10% of residential designed to provide convenient wheelchair access. It is our understanding that 10% was chosen as it aligns with planning proposals in Hamilton and Auckland, and that it is a round number which makes calculations easier. This number needs to be higher and building accessibly needs to be normalised. In the tables below, we recommended an increase from 10% to at least 30%. The following information [in the original submission] shows our thought process behind this number, and, in addition, we present this information to council to consider adopting an even higher figure (above 30%) to look long-term to a future with a truly accessible and inclusive built environment. The 2013 Disability Survey showed 27% of people in Nelson were identified as disabled. - The 2013 Disability Survey is 10 years old therefore, we can presume the number of disabled people would have increased in this time. - The 2013 Disability Survey showed that people aged 65 or over were much more likely to be disabled (59%) than adults under 65 years (21%) or children under 15 years (11%). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

FS56.102	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora does not support the requirement to further increase required wheelchair accessible units. Not every development or site is appropriate for wheelchair housing and imposing such a blanket control would be too restrictive.	Accept	*Section 6*
S709.071	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Consider amending rules REr.17B.3, REr.18B.3 and REr.19B.3 to add additional criteria for providing convenient wheelchair access as follows: iv. access into the home and measures at least 1200mm by 1200mm, is covered and has a sensor light. v. In the bathroom there is a toilet located on the level of the home that you enter that has walls already reinforced to attach grab rails. Circulation spaces for easy circulation are evident using features such as wider doorways and hallways.	Housing modifications are required when homes fail to support the residents in their activities of daily living such as washing, toileting etc. Housing modifications can be prevented through incorporating the simple principles of universal or accessible design that considers aging across the lifetime into housing designs. This ensures a home is sustainable and can be adapted to meet the lifetime needs of the resident from the stage where they have young children in pushchairs to when they are elderly and/or have a disability. The team shared stories of why it is important that accessible design is included in the build or re-building of houses. For example, when houses are being built or renovated but do not include simple measures such as the installation of a grab rail, their team receives a referral to install a grab rail. This can take months to happen and leave people vulnerable and at risk of injury. Grab rails cost between $30-$80 and are best installed when bathrooms are being built or renovated so that anchor points are appropriately considered for the grab rail. There is huge cost savings if these are installed at the beginning and are an easy addition to bathrooms and toilets, providing a level of stability for people. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS56.103	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora consider these requirements are too restrictive and do not provide for an appropriate level of housing choice.	Accept	*Section 6*

S709.073	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Strengthen the provisions and especially assessment criteria related to Permeable Landscaped Area by adding wording identifying that the rules are intended to enhance wellbeing. Suggested wording for REr.17H, REr.18H and REr.19H provided: REr.17H.5 "the purpose of the permeable landscaped area rule is two- fold. Firstly, it is intended to provide for green space around buildings as a means of contributing to high quality on-site living environments and to enhance	The preservation, provision and accessible access to open space (green and blue) contributes positively to both public health and urban ecology. Open spaces that are co-designed with the people in the surrounding neighbourhood will meet their needs and maximise end user engagement with the shared space. [Refer to the original submission Appendix A2 - Open Space for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S709.074	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support	Approve rules REr.17.L, REr.17L and REr.17L Outlook and privacy.	Support in full. Support including 'privacy effects on neighbouring sites'. [Refer to the original submission, specifically Appendix A2 - Privacy]	Accept	*Section 6*
S709.075	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend REr.17L.5 Outlook and privacy explanation as follows: The purpose of the outlook and privacy rule is to ensure that residential units have a reasonable degree of privacy, acknowledging that privacy is a basic human need. This is achieved by requiring a minimum separation between principal living rooms and other buildings on the site. The rule also encourages residential units to be orientated towards the street or	[Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S709.076	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend REr.17N.1 to clarify that it is illegal for home occupations to sell alcohol without a licence, as follows: h.it does not involve any of the following activities: v. selling of alcohol without a licence. [and make consequential changes to the other	Support REr.17N.1 in part. Selling alcohol without a licence is an offence under the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2013. Strengthen provisions to include this.	Reject	*Section 6*

S709.078	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend the assessment criteria for rules REr.17B.4, 18B and 19B with additional wording to cover key determinants of health in the built environment and strengthen the assessment criteria to consider the needs of disabled people. Suggested wording as follows: b. quality on-site living environments: iii. whether landscaped areas can be consolidated to allow opportunities for large scale trees, and communal gardens on site, and contribute to the overall quality of outlook space and privacy between residential units. vi. whether the residential units are usable and accessible for disabled people. and d. parking, access and servicing: i. whether safe and direct pedestrian/	Refer to reasons in submission point S709.060 and the original submission.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS56.104	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora consider these requirements are too restrictive and do not provide for an appropriate level of housing choice.	Accept	*Section 6*
S709.079	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support	Approve the residential zone front yards rule, permitted standard REr.18D.1.b [REr.17D.1.b and REr.19D.1.b] as notified, requiring: "where the front yard adjoins a road, 50% of the front yard must have a permeable surface which may include lawn or landscape planting".	Support REr.18DE Front yards in full. Support 50% of the front yard being permeable surface which may include lawn or landscape planting. Permeable surfaces act are particularly important in an urban environment.	Accept	*Section 6*
S709.080	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend the REr.18F.4 Outdoor living court Assessment Criteria as follows: a... b... c... d. whether the outdoor living court is usable and accessible for disabled people.e. whether the outdoor living court has adequate shelter. [and make consequential amendments to rules REr.17F and REr.19F to reflect these changes].	REr.18F.4 Outdoor living court Assessment Criteria - Support in part Designing the outdoor living court 'in favour of sunlight access' will give residents the option to grow food. Outdoor living spaces should be of a usable shape and size, easily accessible, with level access wherever possible. Access to shelter should also be considered. Additional wording suggested to strengthen the assessment criteria to consider the needs of disabled people. This aligns with the reference to 'accessible private outdoor living space' under REr.18F.5.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

FS56.105	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora consider these requirements are too restrictive and do not provide for an appropriate level of housing choice.	Reject	*Section 6*
S709.081	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Amend REr.18H.1 Permeable landscaped area as follows: Buildings are permitted where at least ~~20%~~ 30% of the site is maintained as permeable landscaped area.[and make consequential amendments to the other permeable landscape rules where relevant].	REr.18H.1 Permeable landscaped area - Oppose in part Adequate provision of permeable surface area is important. Permeable surfaces help reduce stormwater loads on the pipe infrastructure by absorbing or detaining rainwater. Urbanisation leads to increased stormwater volumes and peak flows as vegetation is removed and soils are compacted or covered by impervious surfaces such as roofing, asphalt and concrete, which do not absorb water. According to BRANZ, to be effective, permeable surfaces typically need at least 30% void space. Noted other councils are using 30% such as Waipa district council, Queenstown Lakes District Council and Invercargill City District Plan.	Reject	*Section 6*
S709.085	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend rule REr.28.1. Pedestrian access to rear of sites as follows: REr.28.1 a. The outdoor space around any ground level residential unit must have direct, practical pedestrian access to a road, and b. the minimum width of the access	Accessible routes require a minimum clear width of 1,200 mm.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS56.107	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora consider these requirements are too restrictive and do not provide for an appropriate level of housing choice.	Accept	*Section 6*
S709.086	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Approve REr.57 Neighbourhood parks with amendment to add assessment criteria as follows:h. whether the site is accessible and usable for disabled people.	Support in full REr.57 Neighbourhood parks Neighbourhood parks in the residential zone encourage health and wellbeing activities. Creating accessible play spaces, that are inclusive for disabled people, supports health and wellbeing for all. Spatial equity, which considers accessibility, needs, fairness and justice in the way we distribute public service facilities in communities, is fundamental to creating thriving communities. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S709.156	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Subdivision	Support in part	Add to AP14.2.1.iii Context analysis as follows: e. location of all local commercial service and education, recreation, community and health facilities up to 1km of the	Support in part Recommend inclusion of schools, health and community facilities to provide greater context.	Reject	*Section 6*
S709.157	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Subdivision	Support in part	Amend AP14.2.2 Design Description: Subdivision and Development Plan as follows: AP14.2.2.ii movement network a.existing and proposed pedestrian and cycle infrastructure ~~links~~ and their, network connections. ... d. the location of car,mobility and cycle parking spaces.	Recommend addition wording to strengthen provision in line with previous recommendations [in Submission 709].	Reject	*Section 6*
S709.158	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Subdivision	Oppose in part	Add to AP14.2.3.iii design statement content requirements as follows: Design statements should:- explain how the design will meet the needs of disabled people.	Recommend addition wording to strengthen provision in line with previous recommendations [in submission 709].	Reject	*Section 6*
S709.159	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Add to AP14.3.2.ii as follows: Quality subdivision will: d.3.b. Integrate native vegetation, mature trees and significant ecological features and use these as features within public open	Recommend addition wording to strengthen provision in line with previous recommendations [in submission 709].	Reject	*Section 6*
S709.161	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Update the full Appendix 22 Guidelines for comprehensive housing development' to align to best practice. See AP22.3 which provides an example of some additional points that 'The Auckland Design Manual' includes in reference to privacy. And, Consider Increasing reference to the 'Design Guidelines', where relevant, throughout the plan.	Design guidelines, that consider the determinants of health in the built environment, help to inform better design outcomes. Better design outcomes will support public health and wellbeing. For example, Auckland Council refers to 'The Auckland Design Manual' on their website, which explains the importance of good design and helps people understand how to achieve a good design outcome for their project.	Reject	*Section 6*
S709.163	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Consider strengthening AP 22.3 overall outcomes with the following additions:- Onsite planting to screen up to three stories- Orientating and angling adjacent blocks so that they do not directly face each other - Solid or semi-solid	Noted that the guidelines could be strengthened by updating to include best practice enhancements identified in the Auckland Design Manual to support privacy, amongst other areas.	Reject	*Section 6*

S713.001	Cherilyn Barber	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth, energy efficiency, and the ability to grow fruit and vegetables.	Reject	Section 6
S713.002	Cherilyn Barber	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth, energy efficiency, and the ability to grow fruit and vegetables.	Reject	Section 6
S713.003	Cherilyn Barber	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth, energy efficiency, and the ability to grow fruit and vegetables.	Reject	Section 6
S713.011	Cherilyn Barber	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Rezone or amend the rules to achieve] a maximum of 3 storeys for [new subdivisions] outside the city centre.	There should be a maximum of 3 storeys for suburbs outside of the city centre, and only in new subdivisions. The loss of community would be devastating in existing suburbs, especially those areas with many families and elderly, where the "back garden" is an important part of their lives. Loss of sunlight and privacy would have a very negative impact for them.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S713.012	Cherilyn Barber	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Rezone or amend the rules to achieve] a maximum of 3 storeys for [new subdivisions] outside the city centre.	There should be a maximum of 3 storeys for suburbs outside of the city centre, and only in new subdivisions. The loss of community would be devastating in existing suburbs, especially those areas with many families and elderly, where the "back garden" is an important part of their lives. Loss of sunlight and privacy would have a very negative impact for them.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S713.013	Cherilyn Barber	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules to make it easier for residents to add a single storey tiny home to their properties].	Allow for people to more easily add tiny homes to their properties to help increase accommodation supply and also add income for people. This would allow people who value their space and privacy to retain it, while others can make the choice to have a single storey tiny home if they wish to.	Accept	*Section 6*
S714.007	Dorothy Siebet	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S714.008	Dorothy Siebet	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S714.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S714.009	Dorothy Siebet	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S714.012	Dorothy Siebet	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*

S714.014	Dorothy Siebet	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S714.028	Dorothy Siebet	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S714.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S715.007	Susan Ware	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S715.008	Susan Ware	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S715.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S715.009	Susan Ware	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S715.012	Susan Ware	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*

S715.014	Susan Ware	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S715.028	Susan Ware	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S715.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S716.002	Clay Gallagher and Others	Residential Zones	Support	Retain the proposed change to [the building coverage] definition.	Given the removal of the car parking requirements the proposed changes to the definition of building coverage are considered to be necessary and appropriate.	Accept	*Section 6*
S716.003	Clay Gallagher and Others	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Amend DO16.1.1.v [Residential - Standard Area] to acknowledge that there is also an opportunity for Comprehensive Housing Development in this Zone so long as the risks from natural hazards are appropriately	It is considered appropriate that the opportunity to undertake Comprehensive Housing Development in the Standard Area be provided for in the provisions.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS25.025	Port Nelson LTD		Oppose	Reject	PNL opposes any intensification in areas subject to the Port Effects Control Overlay as this area is already subject to potentially higher noise levels and intensification would increase the number of sensitive receptors. Disallow this submission insofar as it relates to any properties within the Port Effects Control Overlay.	Accept	*Section 6*
S716.004	Clay Gallagher and Others	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Amend RE1.4.i [Explanation and Reasons] to provide the opportunity for natural hazards to be appropriately managed.	This explanation states that the Plan seeks to minimise the number of units in this Standard Area due to natural hazard risks. Rather, it is considered that the direction should be to ensure that natural hazards are appropriately managed. Not providing this opportunity is considered to result in an inefficient use of a valuable land resource in close proximity to the City Centre.	Reject	*Section 6*
S716.005	Clay Gallagher and Others	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Amend RE1.4.ii [Methods] to include the opportunity to undertake comprehensive housing development.	This method does not provide reference to the opportunity for Comprehensive Housing Development in the Standard Area.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS25.026	Port Nelson LTD		Oppose	Reject	PNL opposes any intensification in areas subject to the Port Effects Control Overlay as this area is already subject to potentially higher noise levels and intensification would increase the number of sensitive receptors. Disallow this submission insofar as it relates to any properties within the Port Effects Control Overlay.	Accept	*Section 6*
S717.013	Cynthia Martin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Seek to] create more areas along Atawhai frontage for development.	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S719.006	The Domett St/Hardy St/ Tasman St/ Nile St block	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: • Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. • Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. • Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. • Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. • Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. • Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. • Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S719.007	The Domett St/Hardy St/ Tasman St/ Nile St block	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S719.006.	Accept	*Section 6*
S719.008	The Domett St/Hardy St/ Tasman St/ Nile St block	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain] RE2.3.ii and amend to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of privacy as well as encourage residential units to be	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*

S719.011	The Domett St/Hardy St/ Tasman St/ Nile St block	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S722.003	Mary Ayre	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Retain existing notification requirements.	Refer to reasons in submission point S722.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S724.001	John Batt	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Request] no change to the current [NRMP] residential zone rules for maximum building height and daylight admissions.	I oppose the proposed Plan Change 29 changes to all Chapter 7 residential Zone rules relating to maximum building heights and daylight admission. Tall buildings should not be part of our residential zone areas as they will lessen daylight & sun to surrounding properties, reduce privacy and views. The correct place for tall buildings, in Nelson, is the central business district.	Reject	*Section 6*
S725.003	Stephen Mace	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules to enable] very low impact intensification such as granny flats, putting in a second dwelling on a large section, dividing an existing dwelling into two or subdividing larger sections.	It should be made easy for people to do very low impact intensification themselves such as granny flats, putting in a second dwelling on a large section, dividing an existing dwelling into two or subdividing larger sections.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
FS28.146	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: [Amend the rules to enable] very low impact intensification such as granny flats, putting in a second dwelling on a large section, dividing an existing dwelling into two or subdividing larger sections. A tiny home or granny flat or second dwelling comprises an individual residential unit and would provide for potentially inappropriate residential intensification if allowed as a permitted activity on properties with an existing residential unit. There are a number of areas that are not appropriate for further residential intensification in particular those areas subject to the Nelson Airport Overlays and it is important that these areas are not further intensified with sensitive activities.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS38.027	Small Time Developments		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support in part are: [Amend the rules to enable] very low impact intensification such as granny flats, putting in a second dwelling on a large section, dividing an existing dwelling into two or subdividing larger sections. Agree with the intent of this submission to encourage infill in a less intrusive manner, but perhaps the change to 3 dwellings will address this. Not every site will be developed intensively so the granny flat option will be available under this new rule.	Accept	*Section 6*
S726.001	John Bullock	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S726.002	John Bullock	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S726.003	John Bullock	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S727.001	Nicola Hawes	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S727.002	Nicola Hawes	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S727.003	Nicola Hawes	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S728.002	Linda Mace	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Require] resource consent for buildings of multiple stories, which include daylight angle restrictions that don't allow for total shading of a house.	Decrease in sun and an increase in shade. Allowing a 5 storey apartment building into the neighbourhood would decrease our sunlight hours, in some cases reduce them completely. This is at odds with keeping homes warm and dry, and having space to be in the sun which enhances overall well being. Reducing the amount of sun onto an existing property impacts of the benefits of solar panels used to generate electricity. For those who grow their own fruit and vegetables, plenty of sun too is vital.	Reject	*Section 6*
S729.005	Ian Wishart	Residential Zones	Oppose	No permitted category for buildings over one storey in the general residential zone.	Refer to reasons in submission points S729.001 and S729.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
S730.007	Stephanie Gray	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	*Section 6*
S730.008	Stephanie Gray	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point 006.	Accept	*Section 6*

S730.009	Stephanie Gray	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S730.012	Stephanie Gray	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. Eg Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S730.014	Stephanie Gray	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S730.028	Stephanie Gray	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point 26	Reject	*Section 6*
S732.002	John Fitchett	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the deletion of NRMP policy RE1.2(c).	Refer to reasons in submission point S732.003.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.161	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	A great submission and agree with majority of points in their submission and the example at the end is the reason why this plan change is so wrong.	Reject	*Section 6*

S732.007	John Fitchett	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the daylight] recession planes (in any Residential Zone) so that no recession planes commence at a height greater than 4 metres above ground level, and/or uses a recession plane greater than 50 degrees from the horisontal. [Any contravention of this permitted standard is] to be considered as a non-complying activity.	If implemented, the amenity effect (especially as to restriction of sunlight and daylight) to a large proportion of the residential areas of central Nelson, will be substantially negative... the Section 32 Report is defective in that in omits any detailed and objective comment... as to the negative visual and amenity effects on neighbouring and neighbourhood properties of permitted height of 19.5 metres, and recession plane only commencing at 12 metres, and being at 60 degrees... The proposal's premise that non-compliance with (or proposed breach of) the multitude of amenity conditions could be dealt with (and approved) by Council on a "restricted discretionary" basis, is unacceptable as (as stated already) the basic premise that 19.5 metres is appropriate (in the HDZ) would already be written into the Plan. At the Hearing I will be referring to examples where (under the current Plan) Council was prepared to approve Resource Consents on a non-notified basis even though to an average citizen the extent of non-compliance - and effect on neighbours - was substantial. Also, Rules such as REr19 Kand REr 19 J specifically provide that any breach of height and daylight rules (e.g. higher than 19.5 metres, or a blank will at the boundary higher than 12 metres, or a recession plane at greater than 60 degrees) would be dealt with as restricted discretionary; and the interests of a neighbour is only fourth out of the five factors to be considered. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.166	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	A great submission and agree with majority of points in their submission and the example at the end is the reason why this plan change is so wrong.	Reject	*Section 6*

S732.009	John Fitchett	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend Chapter 7 to require] Rear and Side Yard Setback of not less than 1.5 metres.	I Oppose the proposed reduction in rear and side yard Setbacks in Residential Zones. [The reasons are] that (if implemented) the proposal will affect me, and the amenities I currently enjoy, personally and negatively. Refer to reasons in submission points S732.006 and S732.007 and the original submission for more detail.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.168	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	A great submission and agree with majority of points in their submission and the example at the end is the reason why this plan change is so wrong.	Reject	*Section 6*
S732.016	John Fitchett	Residential Zones	Oppose	Amend chapter 7 to reflect opposition to the absence of any requirement to retain "permeable landscaped areas" in the defined manner subsequent to completion of a building	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.175	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	A great submission and agree with majority of points in their submission and the example at the end is the reason why this plan change is so wrong.	Reject	*Section 6*
S732.039	John Fitchett	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose [the operative] rule REr.22.1 permitting Comprehensive Housing Developments [in the Comprehensive Area, Standard Area and Residential - Lower Density Area only].	I oppose the standards proposed for Comprehensive Residential Development (CRD) to be able to progress without needing a Resource Consent [sic]. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.200	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	A great submission and agree with majority of points in their submission and the example at the end is the reason why this plan change is so wrong.	Reject	*Section 6*

S732.040	John Fitchett	Mapping	Amend	Encompass all the residential portion of the city in the plan change.	I OPPOSE the retention of most or all of The Wood (generally north east of the Maitai River) as Residential Comprehensive: basically with height, yards and other amenity provisions remaining generally as they are at present UPON THE GROUNDS/REASONS that as this proposal is said to be the most dramatic/ extensive in a generation, • this Plan Change should encompass all the residential portion of the city and not exclude from consideration the substantial area generally to the north of the Maitai River but south of the Wakapuaka Cemetery; and • that area (north of the Maitai) had earlier been confirmed by Council as appropriate for greater (or equal) intensification as the area now proposed to be zoned HDZ • if risk of inundation is as great as suggested, then the proposal should deal constructively with it, and not allow the existing scenario to continue.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS28.148	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Encompass all the residential portion of the city in the plan change. The Tahunanui (flat) and Monaco residential areas are largely outside the PC29 boundaries and comprise either standard residential or low-density zoning. Applying a general residential or intensification zoning across all existing residential zones would provide for residential intensification as a permitted activity. However, there are a number of areas that are not appropriate for further residential intensification, in particular those areas subject to the Nelson Airport Overlays.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS83.201	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	A great submission and agree with majority of points in their submission and the example at the end is the reason why this plan change is so wrong.	Accept	*Section 6*

S732.041	John Fitchett	Mapping	Amend	Include the Wood in the Plan change intensified residential zones [specific zone not specified].	Refer to reasons in submission point S732.040.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.202	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	A great submission and agree with majority of points in their submission and the example at the end is the reason why this plan change is so wrong.	Reject	*Section 6*
S732.044	John Fitchett	Residential Zones	Amend	Encourage intensification by encouraging developers to build two storey houses on allotments as small as 200 square metres in any Residential zone.	If intensification is necessary: it can be achieved by encouraging developers • to build apartment blocks in the Inner City Zone "as of right"; and without the extensive requirements to comply with the then current thinking (as to design etc) of Council's planners; and/or • to build two storey houses on allotments as small as 200 square metres in any Residential zone; and/or • to build several "small" units in several buildings on one allotment: but meeting a maximum height of 10 metres.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS28.149	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Encourage intensification by encouraging developers to build two storey houses on allotments as small as 200 square metres in any Residential zone. The Tahunanui (flat) and Monaco residential areas are largely outside the PC29 boundaries and comprise either standard residential or low-density zoning. Applying a general residential or intensification zoning across all existing residential zones would provide for residential intensification as a permitted activity. However, there are a number of areas that are not appropriate for further residential intensification, in particular those areas subject to the Nelson Airport Overlays.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS83.205	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	A great submission and agree with majority of points in their submission and the example at the end is the reason why this plan change is so wrong.	Reject	*Section 6*
S732.045	John Fitchett	Residential Zones	Amend	Encourage intensification by encouraging developers to build several "small" units in several buildings on one allotment: but meeting a maximum height of 10 metres.	Refer to reasons in submission point S732.044.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS83.206	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	A great submission and agree with majority of points in their submission and the example at the end is the reason why this plan change is so wrong.	Reject	*Section 6*
S733.001	Allan Barber	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth, energy efficiency, and the ability to grow fruit and vegetables.	Reject	Section 6
S733.002	Allan Barber	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth, energy efficiency, and the ability to grow fruit and vegetables.	Reject	Section 6
S733.003	Allan Barber	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth, energy efficiency, and the ability to grow fruit and vegetables.	Reject	Section 6
S735.006	Ulf and Eva Kerer	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments [inferred].	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S735.007	Ulf and Eva Kerer	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S735.010	Ulf and Eva Kerer	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S735.009.	Reject	*Section 6*
S737.001	Mark Christieson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S737.002	Mark Christieson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S737.003	Mark Christieson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S738.007	Sali Matthews	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S738.008	Sali Matthews	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S738.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S738.009	Sali Matthews	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S738.012	Sali Matthews	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*

S738.014	Sali Matthews	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S738.028	Sali Matthews	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S738.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S740.001	Janet Southwick	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S740.002	Janet Southwick	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S740.003	Janet Southwick	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S740.009	Janet Southwick	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Seek to] allow more "granny flats", small 2 bedroom homes that are only 1 storey.	Not stated.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS38.029	Small Time Developments		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support in part are: [Seek to] allow more granny flats", small 2 bedroom homes that are only 1 storey. Agree with the intent of this submission to encourage infill in a less intrusive manner, but perhaps the change to 3 dwellings will address this. Not every site will be developed intensively so the granny flat option will be available under this new rule.	Accept	*Section 6*
S740.013	Janet Southwick	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to retain the existing [daylight recession planes] in the [Nelson Resource Management Plan].	Sunlight is a critical part of living in Nelson and one of the reasons I moved here 25 years ago. [It is important for growing vegetables, vitamin D, mental health, preventing mould and dampness, lowering heating bills, and the functioning of solar panels]. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S740.019	Janet Southwick	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Council working closely with Kainga Ora to provide a better way ofcreating new social housing developments that 'fit' with long term designvisions of Nelson. Council have more 'fit for purposecontrols' for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour'senjoyment	There are too many examples where [social housing] has resulted in disharmony in neighbourhoods. High density living for the homeless and vulnerable will not result in healthy outcomes for all considered.	Reject	*Section 6*
S741.001	David Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S741.002	David Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S741.003	David Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S741.019	David Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Intensify housing around Haven Road and Wakefield Quay.	There will be minimal impact on others due to a hill on the south and east sides of the structure.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS25.027	Port Nelson LTD		Oppose	Reject	PNL opposes any intensification in areas subject to the Port Effects Control Overlay as this area is already subject to potentially higher noise levels and intensification would increase the number of sensitive receptors. Disallow this submission insofar as it relates to any properties within the Port Effects Control Overlay.	Accept	*Section 6*
S742.001	David Worthington	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S742.002	David Worthington	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S742.003	David Worthington	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S743.001	Ana Reyes	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S743.002	Ana Reyes	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S743.003	Ana Reyes	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S744.001	Judith Dix	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S744.002	Judith Dix	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S744.003	Judith Dix	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S745.001	Rosemarie Manktelow	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S745.002	Rosemarie Manktelow	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S745.003	Rosemarie Manktelow	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S746.001	Melissa Short	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S746.002	Melissa Short	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S746.003	Melissa Short	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S748.007	David Smith	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	*Section 6*
S748.008	David Smith	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point 006.	Accept	*Section 6*
S748.009	David Smith	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S748.012	David Smith	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. Eg Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S748.014	David Smith	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S748.028	David Smith	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point 26	Reject	*Section 6*

S749.002	Dennis Goodman	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend the daylight admission rules to require a minimum of 5 hours direct sunshine in winter and introduce more nuanced rules regarding building locations adjacent to north and south boundaries [inferred].	Avoid shading issues on existing properties. The ground floor of any dwelling should, in my opinion, receive a minimum of 5 hours of direct sunshine, even in winter. Do not build, for example, 6-storeyed apartments on the south side of an east-west street, e.g. Nile St, as that will only shade properties behind. Build on the north side and such shading will be much less.	Reject	*Section 6*
S749.003	Dennis Goodman	Residential Zones	Amend	Limit the height of new development to 3-4 storeys except in particular situations that can accommodate taller buildings without impacting shading on other properties [inferred].	From what I see in Christchurch I'd suggest 6 storeys is too high in general. 3-4 storeys is more appropriate. Although if a development was to take place over, for example, Buxton Square, you'd have ground level car parking, and could have 6-8 storeys of apartments above that.	Accept	*Section 6*
S750.008	Julie Carter	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification [inferred].	I am also opposed to the increase of residential units beyond 4, as a restricted discretionary activity that does not require notification and written approval from neighbours. This planning is completely out of character and would impact on existing residents without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S750.012	Julie Carter	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Restrict] the height of new builds to be not more than two stories, [and retain the] existing daylight angles that allow for sun and winter sun [from the NRMP]	Refer to reasons in submission point S750.007.	Reject	*Section 6*

S752.007	Helke Florkowski	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. Plan 29 enables rich landowners to develop mega mansions on a single block of land, taking away their neighbour's sun and daylight. This will not create more housing but will disadvantage the rest of the neighbourhood. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S752.008	Helke Florkowski	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S752.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S752.009	Helke Florkowski	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S752.012	Helke Florkowski	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S752.014	Helke Florkowski	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*

S752.028	Helke Florkowski	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S752.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S754.007	Jan Jordan	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their homes. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. Reduction in the ability for people to grow their own food. [In addition], hill properties already have shading issues directly from the hill which is another reason for not having high density development on hills. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S754.008	Jan Jordan	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S754.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S754.009	Jan Jordan	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S754.012	Jan Jordan	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley, Tasman Heights, Marsden Valley, and Bayview in Atawhai.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*

S754.014	Jan Jordan	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 2 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S754.028	Jan Jordan	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S754.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S754.038	Jan Jordan	Residential Zones	Oppose	Assess the impacts of future garaging and carparking.	This is not included in site coverage, taking up green space, with potential dramatic effects on stormwater discharge from properties.	Reject	*Section 6*
S757.006	Kathryn McDonald	Residential Zones	Oppose	Consider a rule requiring rooves to be painted in light, heat reflecting colours, not dark heat absorbing colours	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S757.007	Kathryn McDonald	Residential Zones	Oppose	Require notification and written approval from neighbours for new development [inferred].	Taking away the rights of citizens to object to proposed developments is anti-democratic in the extreme. NZ law provides that a landowner may not unreasonably interfere with the use and enjoyment of someone's property. The proposed changes do exactly that - laying Council to the possibility of being sued. If the plan change goes ahead it will lead to uncertainty for people wishing to buy or sell properties. The idea of people not being able to object to developments having an impact on them is simply draconian - more like a dictatorship than a modern democracy.	Reject	*Section 6*
S757.009	Kathryn McDonald	Residential Zones	Oppose	Retain the current daylight angles under the NRMP [inferred].	Changing the allowed daylight angles will inevitably have a negative effect on people's health and wellbeing. People would be put off installing solar systems where their rooves might be shaded in future. Having a shaded house increases need for other heating [which includes] extra costs for tenants / owners and require more infrastructure.	Reject	*Section 6*
S757.010	Kathryn McDonald	Heritage	Oppose	Any development should preserve the character of the street frontages.	Gradual infill, e.g. as in Tipahi St preserves the character of street frontages.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS65.371	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Any development should preserve the character of the street frontages. Reasons include (please also refer to our original submission #831 as in many cases multiple reasons have been noted): PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new study on effects of proposals on heritage and character of City. The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice. It has been undertaken by one person rather than a multidisciplinary team.	Reject	*Section 6*
S763.001	Jilly Blackman Stevens	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S763.002	Jilly Blackman Stevens	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S763.003	Jilly Blackman Stevens	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S763.011	Jilly Blackman Stevens	Residential Zones	Oppose	Retain the NRMP daylight admission standards [inferred].	The lack of protection for sunlight to adjacent properties, a critical element in all urban residential amenities - enabling energy efficiency, warmth and wellbeing.	Reject	*Section 6*
S764.004	Elise Tull	Residential Zones	Amend	[Require] suitable roofing colours and materials.	If black or dark roofing - would attract more heat, thus an environmental issue.	Reject	*Section 6*

S769.007	Peter Fierek	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings be built on all new developments.	As an immigrant from Germany I was pretty surprised by the lack of developments going up, and all new settlements spreading outwards removing valuable agricultural and environmental important land. It just didn't make sense to me building ever bigger dwellings on ever smaller sections with less green spaces and trees. The questions I always had were, why do we have no basements here for storage and utilities, and why not build up like in Europe where a 60m² building footprint can provide 240m² of living space?	Reject	*Section 6*
S769.009	Peter Fierek	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces.	Reject	*Section 6*
S769.012	Peter Fierek	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	The loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 would have the following effects onto us: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp home with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Increased heating costs Less prospect of investing in Solar systems for power supply, hot water and electric car charging. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress, because the house would be less desirable to live in. Less outdoor activities. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S769.013	Peter Fierek	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S769.012.	Accept	*Section 6*
S769.014	Peter Fierek	Residential Zones	Oppose	Support the inclusion of RE2.4.i.	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Accept	*Section 6*
S770.003	Wainui Properties Limited	Residential Zones	Support	Retain the proposed change to [the building coverage] definition.	Given the removal of the car parking requirements the proposed changes to the definition of building coverage are considered to be necessary and appropriate.	Accept	*Section 6*

FS78.534	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Various. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences.	Reject	*Section 6*
S770.007	Wainui Properties Limited	Residential Zones	Oppose	In conjunction with amendments to the relevant daylight admission rules, change policy RE2.3 to provide appropriate recognition of the impacts anticipated from intensification.	PC29 will fundamentally change the current daylight admission rules in the NRMP and yet PC29 does not proposed any change to policy RE2.3. It is considered that RE2.3 must also be amended as the new daylight admission rule will lead to additional shading impacts.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS78.538	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Various. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences.	Reject	*Section 6*
S770.008	Wainui Properties Limited	Residential Zones	Oppose	In conjunction with amendments to the relevant bulk and location rules, change policy RE2.4 to provide appropriate recognition of the impacts anticipated from intensification.	PC29 will fundamentally change the current bulk and location rules in the NRMP and yet PC29 does not proposed any change to policy RE2.4. It is considered that RE2.4 must also be amended as the bulk and location rules will lead to additional impacts on privacy and outlook.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS78.539	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Various. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences.	Reject	*Section 6*
S770.009	Wainui Properties Limited	Residential Zones	Oppose	In conjunction with amendments to the relevant bulk and location rules, change policy RE2.5 to provide appropriate recognition of the impacts anticipated from intensification.	PC29 will fundamentally change the current bulk and location rules in the NRMP and yet PC29 does not proposed any change to policy RE2.5. It is considered that RE2.5 must also be amended as the bulk and location rules will lead to impacts on the building character and amenity of residential areas.	Accept	*Section 6*

FS78.540	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Various. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences.	Reject	*Section 6*
S770.020	Wainui Properties Limited	Residential Zones	Support	Retain rule [REr.19O Non-residential activities (excluding home occupations)].	This rule [REr.19O] effectively retaining the current discretionary activity status for non-residential activities. This is supported.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS78.551	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Various. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences.	Reject	*Section 6*
S771.007	Trish and Charlie Goulter	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S771.008	Trish and Charlie Goulter	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S771.007.	Accept	*Section 6*

S771.009	Trish and Charlie Goulter	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S771.012	Trish and Charlie Goulter	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S771.014	Trish and Charlie Goulter	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S771.028	Trish and Charlie Goulter	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S771.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S774.003	Allison McNabb	Residential Zones	Oppose	Retain the current recession planes (sunlight angles) and remove the recession planes proposed in Plan Change 29.	NCC recession planes, generally known as our sun angles, are the most important protection for the main reason people come to live here, pay the price our land/houses command, and protect the number one most important thing to houseowners. Refer also to the NCC and TDC jointly commissioned study on Housing Demand Preferences from m.e. Consulting in 2021. The proposed Plan Change 29 allows for extensive areas of suburban infill where up to 3 dwellings can be built on one section. There is potential for 3 story buildings where the current recession planes can be met by careful planning of not only the building but the permeable surface and off street parking. It would surely be prudent to take a "wait and see" approach by allowing design initiatives, suburban infill and apartment style housing to gain momentum and acceptance. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.219	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	*Section 6*

S774.007	Allison McNabb	Residential Zones	Oppose	Any building consent for residential, or accommodation buildings of more than two stories, require any alteration that increases the number of units or resident capacity, should require further notification and the same process as the original consent.	We are aware from discussions with staff that if, for example, a three story building containing three family apartments gained consent that any alteration that does not alter the predominant use (in this case housing) or the envelope of the building it would be regarded as a minor alteration and not notified. We believe then that this would allow a developer to build a large footprint 3 story building consented as having three apartments to then seek a and obtain an amendment for a minor change to allow 40 single room bedsits, build it and sell it to Kainga Ora. To any neighbourhood or community this is a serious concern and it is certainly against the intent of my submission. It would be a useful and no doubt optional path for a developer to take in some circumstances and the Plan should be constructed to ensure that no such loopholes are not available.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.223	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	*Section 6*
S776.007	Warwick Rogers	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S776.008	Warwick Rogers	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S776.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S776.009	Warwick Rogers	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S776.012	Warwick Rogers	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S776.014	Warwick Rogers	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S776.028	Warwick Rogers	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S776.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S778.007	Dr Hayden Thomas & Family	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S778.008	Dr Hayden Thomas & Family	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S778.007.	Accept	*Section 6*

S778.009	Dr Hayden Thomas & Family	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S778.012	Dr Hayden Thomas & Family	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S778.014	Dr Hayden Thomas & Family	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S778.028	Dr Hayden Thomas & Family	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S778.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S781.005	Michael Rose (Rose Family Trust)	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings be built on all new greenfield developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	We are opposed to new 'green field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification without affecting existing suburbs. Infrastructure is easier and cheaper to develop on flat land and would provide more housing without affecting neighbouring properties.	Reject	*Section 6*

S781.006	Michael Rose (Rose Family Trust)	Residential Zones	Oppose	Include Daylight and Sunlight policy statement Para RE2.3.i: The reception of daylight and sunlight to each household unit is a critical component of residential amenity that provides warmth and energy efficiency, and is vital for outdoor activities such as gardening and recreation.	Sunlight is an essential part of living in Nelson and why we chose to live on the Tāhunanui Hills. Our house has been built for the sun and for the garden to receive sun. It will be subjected to the loss of sunlight by neighbouring intensification with the following possible effects: All 5 edges of our property could have 6 story high apartments one metre from the boundary completely enclosed our property in a very high box of buildings. This could compromise our health. Hill properties like ours already have additional shading issues directly from the hill which is another reason for not having high density development on hills. The lack of sunlight could result in existing homes becoming dark and damp with associated mould and mildew. Our house could lose property value if it is surrounded on all sides by apartments. We still have a mortgage so there will be increased financial stress if this is to occur. Privacy and outlook is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Accept	*Section 6*
S782.003	MGT Holdings Limited	Residential Zones	Support	Retain the proposed change to [the building coverage] definition.	Given the removal of the car parking requirements the proposed changes to the definition of building coverage are considered to be necessary and appropriate.	Accept	*Section 6*
S782.007	MGT Holdings Limited	Residential Zones	Oppose	In conjunction with amendments to the relevant daylight admission rules, change policy RE2.3 to provide appropriate recognition of the impacts anticipated from intensification.	PC29 will fundamentally change the current daylight admission rules in the NRMP and yet PC29 does not proposed any change to policy RE2.3. It is considered that RE2.3 must also be amended as the new daylight admission rule will lead to additional shading impacts.	Accept	*Section 6*
S782.008	MGT Holdings Limited	Residential Zones	Oppose	In conjunction with amendments to the relevant bulk and location rules, change policy RE2.4 to provide appropriate recognition of the impacts anticipated from intensification.	PC29 will fundamentally change the current bulk and location rules in the NRMP and yet PC29 does not proposed any change to policy RE2.4. It is considered that RE2.4 must also be amended as the bulk and location rules will lead to additional impacts on privacy and outlook.	Reject	*Section 6*

S782.009	MGT Holdings Limited	Residential Zones	Oppose	In conjunction with amendments to the relevant bulk and location rules, change policy RE2.5 to provide appropriate recognition of the impacts anticipated from intensification.	PC29 will fundamentally change the current bulk and location rules in the NRMP and yet PC29 does not proposed any change to policy RE2.5. It is considered that RE2.5 must also be amended as the bulk and location rules will lead to impacts on the building character and amenity of residential areas.	Accept	*Section 6*
S782.019	MGT Holdings Limited	Residential Zones	Support	Retain rule [REr.19O Non-residential activities (excluding home occupations)].	This rule [REr.19O] effectively retaining the current discretionary activity status for non-residential activities. This is supported.	Accept	*Section 6*
S783.001	Susan Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S783.002	Susan Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S783.003	Susan Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S783.016	Susan Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Seeks] that the current daylight angles in the [Nelson Resource Management Plan] remain and are not altered.	The proposed plan change 29 daylight angles do not take into account the impact this will have on existing residents health, both mentally and physically. We should all be entitled to sunshine and the energy (including solar) it produces for our homes to healthy, mould free, damp free and warm.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS20.009	Tim Bayley		Support	Accept	The existing daylight angles are critical to a decent life in Nelson ... maintain in all existing residential areas.	Reject	*Section 6*
S784.001	Pauline Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S784.002	Pauline Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S784.003	Pauline Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S785.001	Christine Hansen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S785.002	Christine Hansen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S785.003	Christine Hansen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S785.015	Christine Hansen	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S785.016	Christine Hansen	Residential Zones	Oppose	Include a Daylight and Sunlight policy statement.	Refer to reasons in submission point S785.015.	Accept	*Section 6*
S785.019	Christine Hansen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Request] Council consider the inclusion of one and two storey dwellings to be built on all new	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S785.020	Christine Hansen	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S785.028	Christine Hansen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing	Refer to reasons in submission point S785.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S786.001	David Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S786.002	David Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S786.003	David Allen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S787.001	Roger Wilson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S787.002	Roger Wilson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S787.003	Roger Wilson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S788.001	Neal Rhodes	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S788.002	Neal Rhodes	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S788.003	Neal Rhodes	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S789.001	Barry Beams	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S789.002	Barry Beams	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S789.003	Barry Beams	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S790.001	Yvonne Beams	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S790.002	Yvonne Beams	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S790.003	Yvonne Beams	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S791.001	Simon Kelly	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S791.002	Simon Kelly	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S791.003	Simon Kelly	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S792.001	Michelle Viskovich	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S792.002	Michelle Viskovich	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S792.003	Michelle Viskovich	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S793.001	Charlotte Townsend	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S793.002	Charlotte Townsend	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S793.003	Charlotte Townsend	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S794.001	Deanna Chapman	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S794.002	Deanna Chapman	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S794.003	Deanna Chapman	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S795.001	Colleen Kidson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S795.002	Colleen Kidson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S795.003	Colleen Kidson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S796.001	Deborah Verdonk	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S796.002	Deborah Verdonk	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S796.003	Deborah Verdonk	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S797.001	Jocelyn Tucker	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S797.002	Jocelyn Tucker	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S797.003	Jocelyn Tucker	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S798.001	Ron Tucker	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S798.002	Ron Tucker	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S798.003	Ron Tucker	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S799.001	Heather McAlister	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S799.002	Heather McAlister	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S799.003	Heather McAlister	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S800.001	Jill Stevenson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S800.002	Jill Stevenson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S800.003	Jill Stevenson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S801.001	Allison Tuckwell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S801.002	Allison Tuckwell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S801.003	Allison Tuckwell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S802.001	Garry Way	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S802.002	Garry Way	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S802.003	Garry Way	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S803.001	Oxana Edmonds	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S803.002	Oxana Edmonds	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S803.003	Oxana Edmonds	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S804.001	Robert Edmonds	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S804.002	Robert Edmonds	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S804.003	Robert Edmonds	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S805.006	Lesley Abrey	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules for] intensification proposals to be done through a resource consent process (similar to the current process, where notification is required).	Projects should be designed on an ad hoc basis and subject to 'resource consent' requirements which protect the amenity values of neighbouring properties (namely sunlight and privacy). Infill housing should be permitted where it is suitable and doesn't detract from amenity values.	Reject	*Section 6*

S805.010	Lesley Abrey	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Maintain] the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	NCC and TDC rank 'sunshine' as the highest preference for housing choice in Nelson and yet PC29 will remove that amenity from its existing residents. The loss of protection of sunlight will have adverse effects, especially in the winter months, e.g.: Lack of warmth and energy efficiency will lead to increased levels of damp and mouldy homes (and associated respiratory illnesses). This will negate the positive aspects of solar panels [and] render existing installations ineffective. Increased heating costs and associated carbon footprint.	Reject	*Section 6*
S806.001	Selina Wilkinson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S806.002	Selina Wilkinson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S806.003	Selina Wilkinson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S808.001	Barbara and Bernard Thorpe	Residential Zones	Oppose	Retain the existing NRMP rules for daylight angles, distance from boundaries, and height of buildings [inferred].	We believe that an adequate level of sunlight around and on everybody's house is a human need as of right to maintain physical and mental health; it is accepted now in our Country and provided for in planning and building law, in the minimum daylight angle required between buildings: 25.5 degrees. The problem of shading and crowding can be mostly avoided by a firm adherence to and enforcement of this rule; it would tend also to prevent or at least greatly reduce the proliferation of dumpy apartment blocks in established, generally pleasantly laid out precincts. We want to live in a congenial community, and can only do so if the rules of its arrangement embody considerations for everybody's fundamental human needs. We ask that the most earnest efforts, carried out on soundest and tested principles of planning and design, are determined and continue to be applied in the ongoing development of Nelson City. If anyone wants or needs to grow their own food (because of preference or they have chemical intolerances and have a restricted income) this is mostly possible at present, as we have sufficient sunlight for a home garden, due to the minimum daylight angle rule that governs the placement and height and boundary distance of residential buildings. Intensification of population by infilling existing established areas needs to observe this rule, to satisfy the right of privacy and no blocking of sunlight for all residents. While exceptions are already available on application, i.e.: for daylight angles, distance from boundaries, neighbouring buildings and roads, right of way and public spaces; the agreement of neighbouring and affected property owners should be required. The proposed removal of the present rules governing the building of oversized housing and units could lead to unintended and unfortunate consequences both to the lives of residents and the quality of the traditional residential environment.	Reject	*Section 6*
S808.002	Barbara and Bernard Thorpe	Residential Zones	Oppose	Exceptions [to the current rules] are already available on application, [and should continue to require] the agreement of neighbouring and affected property owner	Refer to reasons in submission point S808.001.	Reject	*Section 6*

S809.007	Jeanette Dungan	Residential Zones	Oppose	Include Daylight and Sunlight policy statement Para RE2.3.i [from the NRMP].	I support the inclusion of Daylight and Sunlight policy statement Para RE2.3.i: The reception of daylight and sunlight to each household unit is a critical component of residential amenity that provides warmth and energy efficiency, and is vital for outdoor activities such as gardening and recreation, not to mention emotional health. Adequate sunlight is a key factor for good mental health, as it is known that some people suffer Seasonal Affective Disorder, when they do not have enough sunlight. HDZ would allow smaller sections, more height, and so could potentially affect the light advantages most of us enjoy.	Accept	*Section 6*
S810.001	Robert Bruce	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S810.002	Robert Bruce	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S810.003	Robert Bruce	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S810.009	Robert Bruce	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Requests] Right of appeal for any planned tall building.	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S811.001	Narumon Glumglai	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S811.002	Narumon Glumglai	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S811.003	Narumon Glumglai	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S811.009	Narumon Glumglai	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Oppose] high rise buildings outside of the CBD.	The process has been rushed through without preliminary community consultation, Lack of consent from neighbors would be a serious problem. The right to build three units on small city sections is ridiculous. Sunlight angles are wrong and very important. Noise control and parking [are] serious concerns. Better use of underutilized inner city buildings. Restrict high-rise to CBD. Encourage tiny house development by providing land. Low rise intensification is more acceptable. City council could buy back bigbox retailers who are relocating to Tahunanui, and redevelop.	Reject	*Section 6*
S812.003	Alastair Cotterill	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Restrict building heights] in Tahunanui to two or three storeys.	The height of buildings in residential area and Inner-City and CIty Fringe need to be carefully thought through for the future of Nelson City and Tahunanui where I live. We have outstanding city in Nelson and the suburb of Tahunanui is beautiful. I believe in development and progress but has to be done on a case to case basis.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS61.052	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support in part	Accept in part	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- The height of buildings in residential area and Inner-City and CIty Fringe need to be carefully thought through for the future of Nelson City and Tahunanui where I live. We have outstanding city in Nelson and the suburb of Tahunanui is beautiful. I believe in development and progress but has to be done on a case to case basis. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Suburb/communities should be looked at with community case by case.	Accept	*Section 6*

FS72.056	Jude Osborne		Support in part	Accept in part	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- The height of buildings in residential area and Inner-City and CIty Fringe need to be carefully thought through for the future of Nelson City and Tahunanui where I live. We have outstanding city in Nelson and the suburb of Tahunanui is beautiful. I believe in development and progress but has to be done on a case to case basis. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Suburb/communities should be looked at with community case by case.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS60.048	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support in part	Accept in part	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- The height of buildings in residential area and Inner-City and CIty Fringe need to be carefully thought through for the future of Nelson City and Tahunanui where I live. We have outstanding city in Nelson and the suburb of Tahunanui is beautiful. I believe in development and progress but has to be done on a case to case basis Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Suburb/communities should be looked at with community case by case.	Accept	*Section 6*

S813.007	Lorna Sygrove	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. In a report on housing preferences commissioned by NCC and TDC in June, 2021 for the Future Development Strategy (FDS), sunshine was the top priority for housing location. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S813.008	Lorna Sygrove	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S813.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S813.009	Lorna Sygrove	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S813.012	Lorna Sygrove	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S813.014	Lorna Sygrove	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*

S813.028	Lorna Sygrove	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property.	Refer to reasons in submission point S813.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S813.032	Lorna Sygrove	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure people's houses are not shaded by new builds as a non-negotiable clause for all future intensification.	Solar panels on our homes are beneficial for the environment as well as taking the drain off our national grid. Nelson is particularly suited to solar energy production which adds weight to ensuring people's houses are not shaded by new builds.	Reject	*Section 6*
S814.001	S. Wastney	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S814.002	S. Wastney	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S814.003	S. Wastney	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S814.009	S. Wastney	Residential Zones	Amend	[Amend the rules to] require consent or written approval from neighbours and/or affected parties for multi-storey buildings.	I do not think that these multi-storey buildings should be built without consent or agreement from neighbors or other affected parties.	Reject	*Section 6*
S815.001	Janice Sowman	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S815.002	Janice Sowman	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S815.003	Janice Sowman	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S816.004	Joanna Plows	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] NCC ensures that more than 4 units requires notification.	I oppose the increase of residential units beyond 4, as a restricted discretionary activity that does NOT require notification and written approval from neighbours. To restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections and taking up lots of on-street car parking - popping up in a residential street without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S816.005	Joanna Plows	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] the current AP15 Daylight protection rules for all existing properties.	Sunlight is the most important aspect for residents as ranked in the Ranked Preferences of Housing Report commissioned by NCC and TDC in June 2021 for the Future Development Strategy. So this should be the major guiding point in a new plan design -- No Loss of Sunlight on neighbouring properties. Access to Sunlight and Green Space are acknowledged as 2 of the most important requirements for Health and Well-being. And what is the point of solar panels on concerned citizen's houses -- or on other potential in-fill housing/units, if they are shaded by a neighbouring development? So existing houses built before and under the current daylight rules will be prone to loss of sunlight under PC29 resulting in: shading of Green Energy systems; increased costs of heating and damp houses; reduction in property value - most buyers want to know how much sun the house gets; another cost on top of the already burgeoning cost-of-living.	Reject	*Section 6*
S816.008	Joanna Plows	Residential Zones	Oppose	Request PC29 include [affordable housing] for those on limited incomes and the homeless.	And those wishing to come and live in Nelson will have to be able to afford the expensive houses or rents. It is abominable that NZ has people living in tents and cars and motel rooms. Will some of the apartment buildings be able to house those on limited incomes and the homeless?	Reject	*Section 6*

S816.019	Joanna Plows	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Ensure] new development is 'design led'.	New development needs to be 'design led' not 'developer led' and planned on a 'neighbourhood' basis to keep each neighbourhood's character. Current modern black houses being built are totally out of character beside an Historic Home.	Reject	*Section 6*
S816.021	Joanna Plows	Residential Zones	Amend	[Support] the building of 'granny flats' or bedsits on site -- with all bathroom and kitchen facilities - to house family members, etc.	Not stated.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS28.152	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part: [Support] the building of 'granny flats' or bedsits on site -- with all bathroom and kitchen facilities - to house family members, etc. A tiny home or granny flat comprises an individual residential unit and would provide for potentially inappropriate residential intensification if allowed as a permitted activity on properties with an existing residential unit. There are a number of areas that are not appropriate for further residential intensification in particular those areas subject to the Nelson Airport Overlays and it is important that these areas are not further intensified with sensitive activities.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS38.031	Small Time Developments		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support in part are: [Support] the building of 'granny flats' or bedsits on site -- with all bathroom and kitchen facilities - to house family members, etc. Agree with the intent of this submission to encourage infill in a less intrusive manner, but perhaps the change to 3 dwellings will address this. Not every site will be developed intensively so the granny flat option will be available under this new rule.	Accept	*Section 6*
S816.022	Joanna Plows	Residential Zones	Amend	[Support building of tiny homes].	I support [tiny homes] and wish to see more support and available land for those choosing this more intensive lifestyle.	Accept	*Section 6*
S817.010	Bruce and Pamela Thomas	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Amend] the 1m boundary rule to be discretionary in some instances.	We consider the 1m boundary rule should be discretionary in some instances -- a 'one rule covers all' is not appropriate in some circumstances.	Reject	*Section 6*

S817.016	Bruce and Pamela Thomas	Residential Zones	Amend	Encourage tiny homes to be built on existing properties where feasible rather than building upwards	Not stated.	Accept	*Section 6*
S818.001	Anne Molloy	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S818.002	Anne Molloy	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S818.003	Anne Molloy	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S819.001	Catherine Larson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S819.002	Catherine Larson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S819.003	Catherine Larson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S821.001	Michael Cooper	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S821.002	Michael Cooper	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S821.003	Michael Cooper	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S823.001	Chris Horner	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S823.002	Chris Horner	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S823.003	Chris Horner	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S825.001	John Harrison	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S825.002	John Harrison	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S825.003	John Harrison	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S826.001	Edwin Morris	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S826.002	Edwin Morris	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S826.003	Edwin Morris	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S828.004	Michele Hite	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Enable intensification through] the use of two-storey terrace housing.	Where houses are removed, the use of two-story terrace houses would be a good way to intensify without losing street character or garden/parking space.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS83.228	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all their submission points.	Accept	*Section 6*
S828.005	Michele Hite	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Require notification of and written approval from neighbours].	I oppose the proposed changes to building activity that do not require written approval from neighbours. I support resource consent site notices being situated at properties so that neighbours are able to be involved in the decision making process. The council's own newsletter points out that all new buildings in the commercial zones will require a resource consent, why are the new residential buildings in the proposed Medium and High Density zones less deserving of scrutiny? My main area of concern is that residents will not get a say in the developments in their neighbourhoods without resource consent rules changing so dramatically. Surely in a democracy, it should not only be those with deep pockets who get a say on how their community should look and be enjoyed.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.229	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all their submission points.	Reject	*Section 6*
S828.006	Michele Hite	Residential Zones	Oppose	Enable secondary minor dwellings as an infill housing solution [inferred].	Secondary minor dwellings would cater for an increasing population and an ageing one. This sort of infill housing on existing residential properties would increase housing capacity without detracting from current street character.	Accept	*Section 6*

FS28.153	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Enable secondary minor dwellings as an infill housing solution [inferred]. A tiny home or granny flat comprises an individual residential unit and would provide for potentially inappropriate residential intensification if allowed as a permitted activity on properties with an existing residential unit. There are a number of areas that are not appropriate for further residential intensification in particular those areas subject to the Nelson Airport Overlays and it is important that these areas are not further intensified with sensitive activities.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.230	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all their submission points.	Accept	*Section 6*
S828.007	Michele Hite	Residential Zones	Oppose	Retain current sunlight as well as daylight angles in residential [zones] [and] no change to set-backs from boundaries.	Three storey buildings (or greater) built close to current residences, which were built under the current daylight rules will adversely affect sun access, let alone any solar panels and passive solar heating that those properties currently enjoy. It is not a very green idea to make solar heating/electricity less appealing. Blocking the sun will lower property values. We all know that if a block of apartments is built, that those on the south (least sunny) side command lower sale prices than those on the north side. If this happens to new apartment builds, the obvious inference is that established houses, which then get their sun blocked by newly built neighbouring buildings, will also have their values negatively impacted.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.231	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all their submission points.	Accept	*Section 6*

S829.001	Gabrielle Huygens	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Request] guidelines/restrictions to prevent developers going for the cheapest [social housing intensification] options.	My main concern is for the proposed Examiner Street area 6 storey Kainga Ora building as it is likely to be one of the first to be built and since it is intended for social housing will presumably be a 'lower budget' style of construction. If it is 'done badly' it will significantly affect a charming and historic part of Nelson that is one of the main gateways to the city. If done well it will help people accept, and see the benefit in, future similar developments. In my opinion, leaving it entirely up to developers to decide on the exterior look and impact of a 6 storey building in an otherwise low-rise area is a mistake. Adopting the Plan change in its entirety is voluntary for Nelson, I understand, so I feel our Council can tweak it to be most beneficial for the future of our city. Nelson has this chance to get it right. The current residents who live in this fringe area of town have already embraced the 15-minute concept and should not be 'punished' by poorly designed buildings. If buildings in commercial zones require consent to ensure 'quality design' then I feel that sensitive design is even more important in residential areas. Residents close to a large building have to look at and live with it 24 hours a day so it affects their quality of life and the value of their home/largest investment.	Reject	*Section 6*

S830.007	Errol Shaw	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S830.008	Errol Shaw	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S830.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S830.009	Errol Shaw	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of privacy as well as encourage residential units to be orientated towards the street or public open space.	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property. Conceivably, walls of windows, heat pumps, and other utilities and their persistent noises all only a metre from my property would turn my outside life into a prison yard, with numerous windows, a constant sense of surveillance. [Refer to original submission for more detail.]	Reject	*Section 6*
S830.012	Errol Shaw	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S830.014	Errol Shaw	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*

S832.001	Christopher Vine	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Restrict building height] nearby [Synagogue Lane] to the present (predominantly one or two storey) height.	I live at Synagogue Lane. Though this small right of way has no special historic designation, three of the four owners live in buildings dating from the mid-nineteenth century. If I am to believe a former occupant of my house, parts of it date to 1847, which if true means that I am the proud owner of what could be the South Island's oldest fireplace! This neighbourhood, literally in the shadow of the Cathedral (and of the Rutherford Hotel, of which more anon), has, from both visual and historical points of view, an [unaccounted] value for its intimate scale and a sense of oasis amid the city's heart. I oppose any development nearby above the present (predominantly one or two storey) height. Much denser housing could only exacerbate the already problematic parking. It was reported to me that at a recent meeting about the plan change, the mayor expressed the opinion that we could learn to live with (and love??) higher buildings; citing, so I gather, the precedents of the aforementioned Rutherford and Civic House. Surely this has to be a perfect example of shooting oneself in the foot! Though we are all familiar with the dictum, "De gustibus non est disputandum", these two buildings have defiled the landscape of this fair city with their extraordinary ugliness: particularly Civic House with its lopsided tower, glowering presence looming over the city with which it is utterly out of scale. Internally it is little better, disastrously planned with a particularly dismal council chamber. A strong warning if ever there was one for avoiding further obscenities of this sort. I would be happy to provide an oral submission, if, as a doddering nonagenarian, I am spared that long!	Reject	*Section 6*

FS65.406	Heritage Nelson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission we support is: I live at Synagogue Lane. Though this small right of way has no special historic designation, three of the four owners live in buildings dating from the mid-nineteenth century. If I am to believe a former occupant of my house, parts of it date to 1847, which if true means that I am the proud owner of what could be the South Island's oldest fireplace! This neighbourhood, literally in the shadow of the Cathedral (and of the Rutherford Hotel, of which more anon), has, from both visual and historical points of view, an [unaccounted] value for its intimate scale and a sense of oasis amid the city's heart. I oppose any development nearby above the present (predominantly one or two storey) height. Reasons include (please also refer to our original submission #831 as in many cases multiple reasons have been noted): PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new study on effects of proposals on heritage and character of City is required. The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice. It has been undertaken by one person rather than a multidisciplinary team.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS78.399	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support is: I live at Synagogue Lane. Though this small right of way has no special historic designation, three of the four owners live in buildings dating from the mid-nineteenth century. If I am to believe a former occupant of our house, parts of it date to 1847, which if true means that I am the proud owner of what could be the South Island's oldest fireplace! This neighbourhood, literally in the shadow of the Cathedral (and of the Rutherford Hotel, of which more anon), has, from both visual and historical points of view, an [unaccounted] value for its intimate scale and a sense of oasis amid the city's heart. I oppose any development nearby above the present (predominantly one or two storey) height. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new comprehensive independent study of the effects of this proposal on the character and heritage buildings of Nelson that informs changes to proposed rules and policies (on and off-site height, boundary set back, daylight angles). The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice. It has been undertaken by one person rather than a multidisciplinary team.	Reject	*Section 6*
S833.001	Marie Brodersow	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S833.002	Marie Brodersow	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S833.003	Marie Brodersow	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S834.001	Rosemary-Anne Gundry	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S834.002	Rosemary-Anne Gundry	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S834.003	Rosemary-Anne Gundry	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S835.001	Carol-Anne Armitage	Residential Zones	Oppose	Restrict building heights of new builds and retain current daylight admission protection rules [inferred].	At the meeting, on questing from the floor, the NCC Planner, admitted to having taken no specific measures on Hours of Sunlight yet quality of life and well-being for all home dwellers must be taken into account. There shouldn't be gains on one side to the detriment of those on the other side, in this case literally, if new builds are so high that they cut out the sun from surrounding homes.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS65.407	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Protect [heritage buildings] from being overshadowed by apartment blocks. Nelson City is full of history with beautiful heritage buildings. These should be protected from being overshadowed by 21st century apartment blocks. Reasons include (please also refer to our original submission #831 as in many cases multiple reasons have been noted): PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new study on effects of proposals on heritage and character of City is required. The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice. It has been undertaken by one person rather than a multidisciplinary team.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.236	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in submission and want NCC to learn from mistakes made in Auckland.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS78.400	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Protect [heritage buildings] from being overshadowed by apartment blocks. Nelson City is full of history with beautiful heritage buildings. These should be protected from being overshadowed by 21st century apartment blocks. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new comprehensive independent study of the effects of this proposal on the character and heritage buildings of Nelson that informs changes to proposed rules and policies (on and off-site height, boundary set back, daylight angles). The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice.	Reject	*Section 6*

S835.005	Carol-Anne Armitage	Residential Zones	Amend	[Enable] the freeing up of council-owned land [and] a streamlined process or incentives for subdivision [and establishment of] minor dwellings or tiny houses.	In a recent article on local architects, Mark Fielding proposed that "secondary minor dwellings" could provide a 50 per cent increase in houses. With the freeing up of council-owned land together with a streamlined process/or incentives for subdivision of properties to allow for a minor dwelling, or tiny house, this could go a long way to addressing the housing shortage.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.239	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in submission and want NCC to learn from mistakes made in Auckland.	Reject	*Section 6*
S837.001	Vernette Morris	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S837.002	Vernette Morris	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S837.003	Vernette Morris	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S838.001	Angeline Johnston	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S838.002	Angeline Johnston	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S838.003	Angeline Johnston	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S839.001	Norma Kaa	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S839.002	Norma Kaa	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S839.003	Norma Kaa	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S839.011	Norma Kaa	Residential Zones	Oppose	Make single family homes into two people/family homes.	Refer to reasons in submission point S839.009.	Accept in part	Accept in part
S839.012	Norma Kaa	Residential Zones	Oppose	Build more duplexes so that people have access to outside gardens.	Refer to reasons in submission point S839.009.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S841.001	Sandra Burke	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S841.002	Sandra Burke	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S841.003	Sandra Burke	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S841.010	Sandra Burke	Residential Zones	Support in part	[Supports] two storey townhouses and granny flats.	Two storey town houses and granny flats cater for individual and group needs [and] ensure there is a mix of users. [The city] needs to be well planned, not rushed, research and understanding the needs of the community [otherwise] lose the character of Nelson. New subdividers can have high density living/zoning - buyers are aware before purchasing.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
FS28.154	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: [Supports] two storey townhouses and granny flats. A tiny home or granny flat comprises an individual residential unit and would provide for potentially inappropriate residential intensification if allowed as a permitted activity on properties with an existing residential unit. There are a number of areas that are not appropriate for further residential intensification in particular those areas subject to the Nelson Airport Overlays and it is important that these areas are not further intensified with sensitive activities.	Reject	*Section 6*
S842.001	Lennane Kernt	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S842.002	Lennane Kernt	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S842.003	Lennane Kernt	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S843.001	Diana Bowering	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S843.002	Diana Bowering	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S843.003	Diana Bowering	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S844.007	Hamish Neill	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S844.008	Hamish Neill	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S844.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S844.009	Hamish Neill	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*

S844.012	Hamish Neill	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S844.014	Hamish Neill	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S844.028	Hamish Neill	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S844.027.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S845.060	GP Investments Limited	Residential Zones	Support	Retain change [(deletion of Schedule H)].	[With regard to REr.105], PC29 proposes to delete Schedule H. This schedule is considered to be historic and now redundant.	Accept	*Section 6*
S845.061	GP Investments Limited	Residential Zones	Support	Retain change [(deletion of Schedule H)].	[With regard to REr.115], PC29 proposes to delete Schedule H. This schedule is considered to be historic and now redundant.	Accept	*Section 6*
S846.001	Suzanne Gibbons	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S846.002	Suzanne Gibbons	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S846.003	Suzanne Gibbons	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S846.012	Suzanne Gibbons	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Rezone residential multi-storey areas] that [will] affect existing neighbours.	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S846.013	Suzanne Gibbons	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Rezone residential multi-storey areas] that [will] affect existing neighbours.	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

S847.001	Ian Faulkner	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S847.002	Ian Faulkner	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S847.003	Ian Faulkner	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S847.010	Ian Faulkner	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Requests] no more 5 storey gated communities that sit in isolation to the rest of the community/residents.	Tahunanui has suffered for decades with some truly terrible housing developments. Any future development needs to be fit into a community plan for development. The sands is a good example of how a 4 storey house/commercial development can work. It blends into the hill, provides retail shops/cafes that add to our community.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS61.038	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Tahunanui has suffered for decades with some truly terrible housing developments. Any future development needs to be fit into a community plan for development. The sands is a good example of how a 4 storey house/commercial development can work. It blends into the hill, provides retail shops/cafes that add to our community. The reasons for my support There should be specific community plans and engagement.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS72.037	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Tahunanui has suffered for decades with some truly terrible housing developments. Any future development needs to be fit into a community plan for development. The sands is a good example of how a 4 storey house/commercial development can work. It blends into the hill, provides retail shops/cafes that add to our community. The reasons for my support: There should be specific community plans and engagement.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS60.029	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Tahunanui has suffered for decades with some truly terrible housing developments. Any future development needs to be fit into a community plan for development. The sands is a good example of how a 4 storey house/commercial development can work. It blends into the hill, provides retail shops/cafes that add to our community. The reasons for my support There should be specific community plans and engagement.	Reject	*Section 6*
S847.012	Ian Faulkner	Residential Zones	Amend	[Requests] more flexibility to put a tiny home on an existing property.	Not stated.	Accept	*Section 6*
S848.001	S Buttner	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S848.002	S Buttner	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S848.003	S Buttner	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S848.009	S Buttner	Residential Zones	Amend	[Suggests] height reductions.	Loss of winter sunlight, privacy and outlook, reduction in value of property, increased off street parking, environmental impact - loss of green space.	Accept	*Section 6*
S849.001	Margaret Trathen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S849.002	Margaret Trathen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S849.003	Margaret Trathen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S850.001	N Mace	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S850.002	N Mace	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S850.003	N Mace	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S851.001	Stephen Gundry	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S851.002	Stephen Gundry	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S851.003	Stephen Gundry	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S852.001	John Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S852.002	John Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S852.003	John Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S853.001	Beverley Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S853.002	Beverley Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S853.003	Beverley Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S854.001	Craig Moore	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S854.002	Craig Moore	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S854.003	Craig Moore	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S855.001	Tracy Farrell and David Tyree	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S855.002	Tracy Farrell and David Tyree	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S855.003	Tracy Farrell and David Tyree	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S856.001	Pamela Goodin	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S856.002	Pamela Goodin	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S856.003	Pamela Goodin	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S857.001	Hubert Martin	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S857.002	Hubert Martin	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S857.003	Hubert Martin	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S858.001	Catherine Hughson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S858.002	Catherine Hughson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S858.003	Catherine Hughson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S858.010	Catherine Hughson	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Suggests] Large housing blocks [be] orientated in a north/south aspect creating less light impact.	I have concerns as to the lack of oversight by council into the design and layout of the city, Council as taken a blanket free for all approach that has the potential to destroy the unique character of Nelson. In my opinion a staged program of development should be used. Older areas such as Kawai, Tipahi Street, Karaka Street areas should be in a 10 year plan, staggered development of older cheaper housing areas.	Reject	*Section 6*
S858.011	Catherine Hughson	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Seeks council consider and address] how light shading to existing properties is to be managed.	If a home owner has gone to the expense of trying to become more self sufficient by installing solar panels, is their right to gain sunlight going to be removed without redress. If a house that was warm in the winter and then becomes shaded and cold, then this has an effect on the residents health and well being, Is their existing right going to be ignored to benefit the profitability of a developer.	Reject	*Section 6*
S859.001	Diane Varey	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S859.002	Diane Varey	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S859.003	Diane Varey	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S860.004	Noah Hosie	Residential Zones	Oppose	Amendment of PC29 to ensure that all recession planes (and commencement height and degree angles) remain as detailed in the NRMP.	I oppose the inclusion of recession planes (in any residential zone) which commence at a height or angle greater than provided in the current NRMP. I bought my home in an area where I knew that there was existing legal protection of residential amenities (in particular as to height and sunlight); and I reasonably expect that to continue. I oppose the absence of any detailed comment as to the visual and amenity effect on neighbouring properties of permitted height of 19.5 metres and recession plane only commencing at 12 metres.	Reject	*Section 6*
S861.007	Wayne Pool	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S861.008	Wayne Pool	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S861.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S861.009	Wayne Pool	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*

S861.012	Wayne Pool	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S861.014	Wayne Pool	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S861.028	Wayne Pool	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S861.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S862.001	Stephanie Strawbridge	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S862.002	Stephanie Strawbridge	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S862.003	Stephanie Strawbridge	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S863.007	Carolyn Sygrove	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. In a report on housing preferences commissioned by NCC and TDC in June, 2021 for the Future Development Strategy (FDS), sunshine was the top priority for housing location. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S863.008	Carolyn Sygrove	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S863.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S863.009	Carolyn Sygrove	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S863.012	Carolyn Sygrove	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S863.014	Carolyn Sygrove	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*

S863.028	Carolyn Sygrove	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S863.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S863.032	Carolyn Sygrove	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure people's houses are not shaded by new builds as a non-negotiable clause for all future intensification.	Solar panels on our homes are beneficial for the environment as well as taking the drain off our national grid. Nelson is particularly suited to solar energy production which adds weight to ensuring people's houses are not shaded by new builds.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS32.006	Peter Olorenshaw		Oppose	Reject	94% of our personal carbon footprint is related to transport - it is far more important to allow increased density in areas close to urban centres and transport nodes than to ensure neighbours don't block solar panels. The previous Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment Jan Wright said how if you want to do something about climate change solar panels are a poor investment: our grid is already over 80% renewable, heading for 95 or 98% and working on transport emissions is much better way to reduce carbon emissions. She said how solar panels produce well at precisely the time we least need it: middle of the day, middle of summer and none at our peak power use times of winter evenings and early mornings. Evidence shows that the low carbon option is actually to demolish existing houses in well located areas despite having to create emissions rebuilding with multiple new houses. This is because the population growth needs to be accommodated somewhere - houses are going to be built. It is far better to build them in places with existing infrastructure and where people can easily walk, bike or bus to their daily travel needs. Having these new houses built on the periphery of existing urban areas is the worst outcome for trying to get coverage from buses (more viable, more frequent, more useful, more attractive the denser the urban areas are), for having bike commuting a viable option and for km of pipelines, trenching roading to build in the first place and maintain in perpetuity.	Reject	*Section 6*

S864.007	Richard Savill	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. In a report on housing preferences commissioned by NCC and TDC in June, 2021 for the Future Development Strategy (FDS), sunshine was the top priority for housing location. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S864.008	Richard Savill	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point s864.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S864.009	Richard Savill	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S864.012	Richard Savill	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S864.014	Richard Savill	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*

S864.028	Richard Savill	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S864.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S864.032	Richard Savill	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure people's houses are not shaded by new builds as a non-negotiable clause for all future intensification.	Solar panels on our homes are beneficial for the environment as well as taking the drain off our national grid. Nelson is particularly suited to solar energy production which adds weight to ensuring people's houses are not shaded by new builds.	Reject	*Section 6*
S865.001	John Molyneux	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S865.002	John Molyneux	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S865.003	John Molyneux	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S866.007	Sarah Mitchell	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S866.008	Sarah Mitchell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S866.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S866.009	Sarah Mitchell	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S866.012	Sarah Mitchell	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S866.014	Sarah Mitchell	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S866.028	Sarah Mitchell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S866.027.	Reject	*Section 6*

S867.007	Cameron Mitchell	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S867.008	Cameron Mitchell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S867.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S867.009	Cameron Mitchell	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S867.012	Cameron Mitchell	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S867.014	Cameron Mitchell	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S867.028	Cameron Mitchell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S867.027.	Reject	*Section 6*

S868.007	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S868.008	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S868.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S868.009	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S868.012	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S868.014	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification, as well as any intensification planned near existing buildings/homes.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S868.028	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S868.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S868.034	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Require] notification of any intensification planned near existing buildings/homes. Owners must be notified and have the right of objecting	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

S868.036	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	No buildings on the ridgelines, and keep views of surrounds, hills, sea etc and [ensure] they are not blocked	Refer to the related reasons in S868.005.	Reject	*Section 6*
S870.007	Sara Cooper	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S870.008	Sara Cooper	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S870.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S870.009	Sara Cooper	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S870.012	Sara Cooper	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S870.014	Sara Cooper	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S870.028	Sara Cooper	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S870.027.	Reject	*Section 6*

S871.007	Garry Cooper	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S871.008	Garry Cooper	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S871.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S871.009	Garry Cooper	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S871.012	Garry Cooper	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S871.014	Garry Cooper	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S872.008	Amanda Young	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	If Plan Change 29 does go ahead, limit the height in the Residential Zone to 2 storeys.	Refer to reasons in submission points S872.001 to 872.003.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.248	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission and especially regarding historical as I never touched on this.	Reject	*Section 6*

S873.007	Vincent Riepen	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: A reduction in property value of 2.4% for each reduced hour of sunlight. Financial stress and anxiety. Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.263	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with their points. The intro reminds us why there were originally 947 submissions in total, our house is our home.	Reject	*Section 6*
S873.008	Vincent Riepen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S873.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS83.264	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with their points. The intro reminds us why there were originally 947 submissions in total, our house is our home.	Reject	*Section 6*
S873.009	Vincent Riepen	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.265	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with their points. The intro reminds us why there were originally 947 submissions in total, our house is our home.	Reject	*Section 6*

S873.012	Vincent Riepen	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings be built on all new green field developments. Eg Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification. This is where the opportunity exists to create satellite communities. Cost of providing servicing infrastructure to be borne by the entire community, and not in an unproportionally bias to existing properties adversely affected, loss value, where proposed PC 29 could occur.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.268	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with their points. The intro reminds us why there were originally 947 submissions in total, our house is our home.	Reject	*Section 6*
S873.014	Vincent Riepen	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.307	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with their points. The intro reminds us why there were originally 947 submissions in total, our house is our home.	Reject	*Section 6*
S873.028	Vincent Riepen	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S873.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.317	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with their points. The intro reminds us why there were originally 947 submissions in total, our house is our home.	Reject	*Section 6*

S874.007	Ingrid Weeks	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S874.008	Ingrid Weeks	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S864.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S874.009	Ingrid Weeks	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S874.012	Ingrid Weeks	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S874.014	Ingrid Weeks	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S874.028	Ingrid Weeks	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

S875.007	Terry and Anna Rodgers	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S875.008	Terry and Anna Rodgers	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S875.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S875.009	Terry and Anna Rodgers	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S875.012	Terry and Anna Rodgers	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S875.014	Terry and Anna Rodgers	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S875.028	Terry and Anna Rodgers	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

S876.007	Brian Rodgers	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S876.008	Brian Rodgers	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S876.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S876.009	Brian Rodgers	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S876.012	Brian Rodgers	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S876.014	Brian Rodgers	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S876.028	Brian Rodgers	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

S877.007	Martin and Paula Hucklesby	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S877.008	Martin and Paula Hucklesby	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S877.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S877.009	Martin and Paula Hucklesby	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S877.012	Martin and Paula Hucklesby	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S877.014	Martin and Paula Hucklesby	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S877.028	Martin and Paula Hucklesby	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S877.027.	Reject	*Section 6*

S878.011	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] the existing [NRMP] daylight angle provisions.	'Sunny' ranked 1st for preferred feature for all Nelson home owners that were surveyed in a study commissioned by the council, yet sunshine is not taken into consideration in the policies of PC29. Sunlight is a critical part of living in Nelson, but also a core physiological need. This feature is actually the main reason why I am putting in a submission. 'Sunny' ranked 1st for preferred feature for all Nelson home owners that were surveyed. By allowing PPC29 through as it stands, all existing houses could be subject to the loss of sunlight which if happens those residents will: - have increased levels of mental illness, anxiety and stress, - find their property value decreases overnight, - no longer be able to use or install solar energy for heating or power, need to use more power to heat their home due to reduced sunlight as a heat source under the shadow, their home will be more likely to become damp and as a result develop mould, mildew and a health outcome being higher respiratory illnesses less likely to add value to their property via infill or improvements, if the unknown of what is going to be built next door is looming over them. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S878.017	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Mapping	Oppose	Retain existing zoning and rules from the NRMP for residential neighbourhoods [inferred].	Residential neighbourhoods should be protected, there is no need for the zoning and rules to change.	Reject	*Section 6*
S878.026	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Residential Zones	Oppose	Reject and opposethe zone changesand everything thathas been altered toenable reducedsunlight andenjoyment to theneighbouringproperties.	REd.9, REd.10 & REd.11 Oppose high intensification residential zones as they stand.	Reject	*Section 6*
S878.028	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Residential Zones	Oppose	Reject and oppose the zone changes and everything that has been altered to enable reduced sunlight to neighbouring properties.	REr.17A - REr.36 Need to investigate in more detail as it relates to the zone changes and intensification. In particular anything the reduces the sunlight and privacy of neighbouring properties.	Reject	*Section 6*

S879.005	Tasman District Council	Residential Zones	Support in part	Reconsider whether urban design assessment and outcomes are sufficiently included in the provisions [in Chapter 7].	[With regard to Chapter 7 Urban Design Outcomes], consideration needs to be given to how urban design outcomes can be achieved in redevelopment proposals. There are some key urban design outcomes such as utilising rear lot laneway and vehicle access instead of front vehicle access. For example, terrace housing site widths 7m or less should be accessed from rear due to impacts on pedestrian use of footpath. Are there any triggers in the plan that require the implementation of best practice urban design? Can this be linked to a consent status? As part of Richmond on the Rise, Tasman is considering utilizing the Urban Design Panel to assess developments, and if a high quality design is confirmed, that a easier consent status is achieved. This would incentivize better design. Rubbish / recycling bin storage areas need to be considered for comprehensive housing developments, particularly with rear lanes.	Accept	*Section 6*
S879.007	Tasman District Council	Residential Zones	Amend	Reconsider recession planes [in Chapter 7] to ensure the current rules are appropriate with topography.	[With regard to Chapter 7 Daylight admission rules], it is not clear whether the recession plains identified are suitable when steep topography is taken into account.	Reject	*Section 6*
S879.008	Tasman District Council	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend the rules [in Chapter 7] so that the standards do not apply to solar panels.	[With regard to Chapter 7 Daylight admission rules], an exception should be considered for solar panels to enable easier installation on roofs which do not face north.	Accept	*Section 6*

S879.009	Tasman District Council	Residential Zones	Amend	[With regard to Chapter 7 Residential rules - acoustic insultation], include appropriate acoustic insultation provisions for any development that includes attached housing.	Acoustic insulation is an extremely important aspect of the success of medium density housing development. It is acknowledged that acoustic insultation is required for bedrooms in the Inner City Zone and Suburban Commercial Zone. However, it is considered that strong acoustic insultation requirements should be required for any developments which propose attached housing (e.g. apartments or terrace housing) in the General Residential, Medium Density Residential or High Density Residential zones.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS25.029	Port Nelson LTD		Support	Accept	PNL supports appropriate levels of acoustic insulation at source. Allow this submission.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS56.131	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora opposes this addition as the Building Act addresses acoustic insulation for attached dwellings.	Accept	*Section 6*
S881.003	Manuka Street Hospital Limited	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Retain the changes to the definition of building coverage.	Given the removal of the car parking requirements the proposed changes to the definition of building coverage are considered to be necessary and appropriate.	Accept	*Section 6*
S881.008	Manuka Street Hospital Limited	Residential Zones	Amend	the MSH site, amend DO16.1.1.iv as follows (or words to similar effect): The primary goal of the High Density Residential Zone is to provide the opportunity for high density housing in close walking distance to commercial services and community facilities. The zone enables a range of housing types, with a focus on more intensive forms of housing, including terraces and apartments at a variety of scales. The zone achieves a high density residential character by generally enabling residential buildings up to six storeys and requiring on site landscaped areas and private open space suitable to the housing types enabled. High density residential development is more intensive than typical low density areas and will result in a high degree of visual change to neighbourhoods. Subject to assessment through the resource consent process, the zone provides for small-scale commercial activities, and other community facilities, including	This provision sets out the overarching goal of the High Density Residential Zone. If hospitals are not provided for a in a separate zone, they should be recognised as an important part of the High-Density Residential Zone. This is anticipated in the NPS-UD which provides at Policy 3.5 which provides that local authorities must be satisfied that additional infrastructure (which includes social facilities and hospitals) to service the development capacity likely to be available. Otherwise, the goal of the zone only anticipates "small-scale commercial activities, reflecting that an increasing residential population requires convenient access to services to meet their day-to-day needs." Refer to reasons in submission point S881.011 and the original submission for more detail.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S881.010	Manuka Street Hospital Limited	Residential Zones	Amend	Should the High Density Zoning be retained on the MSH site, amend Policy RE1.8 as follows (or words to similar effect): Efficiently enable high density residential living that increases housing supply and choice on land within close walking distance of the Inner City and Suburban Commercial zones with a planned built character of residential buildings generally up to six storeys; with supporting small scale commercial activities and other community facilities, including hospitals and healthcare services.	The proposed High-Density Residential Zone policy seeks to "efficiently enable high density residential living that increases housing supply and choice on land within close walking distance of the Inner City and Suburban Commercial zones with a planned built character of residential buildings generally up to six storeys; with supporting small scale commercial activities". No justification has been provided why the Council only considers small-scale commercial activities to be appropriate. If the Council continues to apply the HDR zone provisions to hospitals, these policies must recognise the importance of hospitals in Nelson. Refer to reasons in submission point S881.011 and the original submission for more detail.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S881.011	Manuka Street Hospital Limited	Mapping	Amend	Create and apply a Hospital zoning to the Manuka Street Hospital site at 36-44 Manuka Street and 164 Tasman Street, Nelson; or as an alternative: Amend the plan so as the site is scheduled in the Plan (i.e it is identified in a schedule to the Residential Zone provisions and that specific provisions are applied to the Site through that schedule). The particular standards / rules that should make up this schedule can simply and readily be drawn from the draft Hospital Zone provisions.	MSH is considered to be 'regionally significant infrastructure' being associated with Nelson Hospital. MSH has worked closely with the Council since 2016, including making submission to the draft RPS (June 2016) and to the draft Nelson Plan (December 2020), to ensure that the Nelson Plan appropriately recognises and provides for the existing hospital activity on the site. It is considered that progressing PC29 without provision for a hospital zone (or equivalent) does not: (a) Give effect to the wider requirements to "enable" social infrastructure, community services and business (all of which include hospitals) in accordance with the NPS-UD; (b) Enable the MSH to further develop as a part of supporting the growing needs of its population, being important "additional infrastructure" (NPS-UD, 1.4); (c) Align with Section 74(1)(ea) of the RMA which requires a district council to change its district plan 'in accordance with' a national policy statement and section 75(3)(a) of the RMA which requires that a district plan must 'give effect to a national policy statement'; (d) Implement the NPS-UD as a whole, including taking into account other provisions which support increased residential intensification as a part of a well-functioning urban environment; (e) Achieve other important components of the NPS-UD such as Policy 10 and Objective 3. providing a Hospital zone through PC29 would be an appropriate way to enable the hospital development necessary to support an increase in the surrounding residential population and community and to enable a well-functioning urban environment as required to give effect to the NPS-UD. Alternatively, The scheduling of the site would enable specific provisions in the Residential zone to apply or enable bespoke provisions where those are more appropriate. By way of example a specific permeable landscape rule would apply to recognise the need to efficiently develop the Hospital site. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S881.012	Manuka Street Hospital Limited	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain policy RE2.4 Privacy and outlook as notified.	Policy RE2.4 Privacy and outlook is proposed to ensure that outlook and privacy is not unduly impacted while recognising that this must be considered in the context of the changing residential environment and the planned built character of an area.	Accept	*Section 6*

S881.013	Manuka Street Hospital Limited	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend Policy RE2.6 as follows (or words to similar effect): The size and scale of buildings, structures, and activities should be compatible with the planned built character and amenity of the residential areas while recognising the functional and operational requirements of activities and development including that they:(a) May require greater density than the planned urban character to enable	PC29 will fundamentally change the current bulk and location rules in the NRMP and yet PC29 does not propose any significant change to policy RE2.5. It is considered that RE2.5 must also be amended as the bulk and location rules will lead to significant impacts on the building character and amenity of residential areas.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S881.014	Manuka Street Hospital Limited	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend Policy RE2.6 non-residential activities as follows (or words to a similar effect):Development must be in keeping with an areas' changing planned urban character. ~~No activity should have effects significantly greater than the normal residential use of any property, unless they can be avoided, remedied or mitigated.~~	PC29 does not propose any changes to RE2.6 relating to non-residential activities. It currently requires "no activity should have effects significantly greater than the normal residential use of any property, unless they can be avoided, remedied or mitigated". As explained above, to give effect to Objective 3 of the NPS-UD, the Council must enable more community services to be located in certain areas of urban environments, including where there is high demand for housing or business land. In this case, the Council has identified that there is a high demand for housing in the proposed high-density residential areas so it follows that the policies in the Plan should be updated to reflect this new directive.	Accept	*Section 6*
S881.015	Manuka Street Hospital Limited	Residential Zones	Amend	If the HDRZ is continued to apply to the MSH site, the REr.19C site coverage permitted standard should be specifically excluded from applying to the site	The current MSH site contains 52% site coverage with 10% landscaping.	Reject	*Section 6*
S881.017	Manuka Street Hospital Limited	Residential Zones	Amend	Delete rule REr.19H permeable landscaped area, or amend it to require 10% permeable landscaped areas where non-residential activities are undertaken or specifically on the MSH site.	This rule requires 20% permeable landscape areas. While this may be appropriate on sites used for residential purposes, this zone anticipates non-residential activities as well. Requiring 20% permeable landscape areas does not allow for the efficient development of sites for non-residential activities such as hospitals. By way of example, the current Hospital has 10% permeable area. The addition of a further 10% permeable land would be a significant loss of valuable land resource.	Reject	*Section 6*

S881.019	Manuka Street Hospital Limited	Residential Zones	Support in part	Either: (a) Retain rule REr.19K Daylight admission; or (b) Apply as a part of a Schedule or Hospital Zone.	This new rule will substantially change the daylight amenity received on residential sites in the High Density Zone. However any change within the High Density Zone must also be equally applied to the site, including within a bespoke schedule or Hospital Zone.	Reject	*Section 6*
S881.020	Manuka Street Hospital Limited	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend rule REr.19O Non-residential activities (excluding home occupations) so that it does not apply to hospitals and healthcare activities; and Apply a separate assessment criterion to non-residential activities in the High-Density Residential zone. This criteria should be focused on recognising the degree of change which will be enabled.	This rule effectively retaining the current discretionary activity status for non-residential activities. This is generally supported. However, the assessment criteria which is applied is the same as in the standard area and lower density residential areas (REr.20.4). In MSHL's view non-residential activities contemplated in the lower density area and high density area are, and should be, considered differently; the types of non-residential activities, their scale and their density will differ. It is therefore appropriate to have separate criteria applied to each.	Reject	*Section 6*
S881.021	Manuka Street Hospital Limited	Residential Zones	Amend	If the HDRZ is continued to apply to the MSH site, recognise hospitals and healthcare facilities as a permitted activity in the zone, and provide for the the development of a hospital or healthcare activity as a restricted discretionary activity. Discretion is restricted, for the standard(s) not met, to the matters explained in Attachment 2. A hospital and healthcare activity that contravenes one of these standards is a restricted discretionary activity. Discretion is	If the Council choose not to apply a specific Hospital Zone to the MSH site, it is appropriate and necessary for Hospitals to be specifically recognised as permitted activities and for their development to be restricted discretionary activities with an appropriate list of matters of discretion.	Reject	*Section 6*
S881.022	Manuka Street Hospital Limited	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend rule REr.19S Maximum building length to exempt the MSH site from the rule.	This proposed rule has been designed to address the planned residential intensification and is not appropriate for the MSH site. The recently redeveloped MSH includes largely one large building that has been incrementally redeveloped and extended. The current building is already significantly more then 22m in length.	Reject	*Section 6*

S882.004	Ainslie Riddoch	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Do not allow] up to 4 storey developments right up to neighbouring boundaries without consent and as of right.	I also do not believe that residential neighbourhoods should have up to 4 storey developments right up to neighbouring boundaries without consent and as of right. This takes away the rights and ability of Nelson residents to receive sunlight and privacy in their homes and properties.	Reject	*Section 6*
S882.005	Ainslie Riddoch	Residential Zones	Oppose	Revamp and streamline the current consent process but retain the ability of neighbours to have input into developments adjacent to them.	The current Consent process is too complicated, expensive, and time consuming causing unnecessary delays and expense for even small projects, and this should be revamped to streamline it so that it is not such a burden, but still to retain the ability of neighbours to have input into developments adjacent to them.	Reject	*Section 6*
S885.007	Robert Stevenson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S885.008	Robert Stevenson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S885.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S885.009	Robert Stevenson	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*

S885.012	Robert Stevenson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S885.014	Robert Stevenson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S885.028	Robert Stevenson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S885.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S886.010	Tina Hanrahan	Residential Zones	Oppose	Protect outlook and sunlight of properties adjacent to new development [inferred].	Sunlight - Nelsons light and connection to the environment. Over imposing builds taking out outlook and light have huge impact on the wellbeing of people and the land adjacent.	Reject	*Section 6*
S887.007	Carey Mason	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S887.008	Carey Mason	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S887.007.	Accept	*Section 6*

S887.009	Carey Mason	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S887.012	Carey Mason	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S887.014	Carey Mason	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S887.028	Carey Mason	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S887.027.	Reject	*Section 6*

S888.004	Chris Allison	Residential Zones	Support in part	Support 3 dwellings per title.	[I support] 2.3.4 Support for 3 Dwellings per Title [from the original Nelsust submission (S608)]. [As stated in the Nelsust submission (S608): The proposal to allow 3 dwellings as of right without a resource consent is crucial and was completely overlooked in the Future Development Strategy as a means of increasing density (sic). We think this is the nearest thing to a silver bullet we have for allowing increased density with no additional load on infrastructure*, minimal resources required and at very low cost. The FDS came up with very low numbers possible from this form of intensification, and it completely ignored the potential for "partitioning" existing houses into two. We think that any existing house could be partitioned into two with minimal extensions into side and back yards and so the potential numbers possible with this form of intensification are huge. If realistic partitioning numbers were included in figures then we do not need to rely on such high multi-storey buildings to get the additional dwellings that population growth projections suggest are necessary. Nelsust members did a worked example (original submission) of how this could be done for less than $120k in 2020. This is affordable housing and furthermore is low carbon creation of a new dwelling (as its largely reusing underutilised existing building fabric)].	Accept	*Section 6*

S888.007	Chris Allison	Residential Zones	Amend	Request recession plane changes. [As stated in the Nelsust submission (S608): Change the recession planes to keep the current daylight over regulations [from Appendix 15] for boundaries oriented within 45 degrees of true south, and change to a 45° recession plane starting at 5m above ground level on boundaries oriented within 45 degrees of true north, in all 3 new residential zones. AND the additional rule that once someone has built up 2 stores high to your "Southern" boundary - you can build 2 stories high up to that boundary too].	[I support] 2.3.6 Recession Plane Changes Requested [from the original Nelsust submission (S608)]. [As stated in the Nelsust submission (S608): Nelson is unusual with the existing Nelson Resource Management Plan having recession planes that vary depending on the direction the boundary faces so that winter sunlight, not just daylight, is allowed into your neighbours property. The recession plane for a Southern boundary is a quite low 25° taken from 2.5m above ground level. Other boundaries have steeper angles (35° for East and West boundaries and 45° for Northern boundaries. This is proposed to be radically changed - even in ordinary residential areas... Initially our convenor thought yes this is something we have to change - he has been a solar architect all his working life but suggests we now know how to build houses that need virtually no heating, without relying on winter sun. However this is no relief to someone in an old draughty bungalow. These old houses are literally impossible to insulate or draft proof as efficiently as a new house and many of them rely on winter sun coming over their neighbours' properties to keep them remotely liveable without large external heat inputs. The existing daylight over provisions actually allow quite a lot more development on existing sites than is often supposed. [See the original submission appendix for more detail]... However, there is nothing in plan change 29 that deals with the issue of transitioning to a townhouse typology in our higher density areas, with a cold draughty bungalow to the south of a new high rise apartment building. We offer a solution for transitioning to a townhouse typology. We ask that you change the recession planes and yard setbacks in Plan Change 29 to keep the current daylight over regulations for "Southern" Boundaries but allow building up to "Northern" boundaries - 2 stories high and with 45° recession plane above that... So although this would restrict the amount of DAYlight into your neighbour's south	Reject	*Section 6*

S888.008	Chris Allison	Residential Zones	Amend	Request boundary setback changes. [As stated in the Nelsust submission (S608): Amend the building setback rules [Other Yards rules REr.17E, 18E, 19E] to allow buildings right up to the side boundaries be retained in all zones. AND the additional rule, at least in the medium and high density zones, you can build 2 storeys high up to your "Northern" boundary as of right, and once your Southern neighbour has done that, you can build 2 storeys high up to that boundary too].	[I support] 2.3.7 Boundary Setback Changes Requested [from the original Nelsust submission (S608)]. [As stated in the Nelsust submission (S608): We find it curious the proposals no longer allow people to build up to the boundaries (as of right) in the medium and high density areas. This leads to townhouses not having side walls touching, even in the highest density residential areas and we think this is wrong. Currently you can do this in all residential zones as long as you fit under the recession planes. This is really something we should hold on to and actually build on to. We request that the current ability to build right up to the side boundaries be retained in all zones and extended as noted above so that in at least the medium and high density zones, you can build 2 storeys high up to your "Northern" boundary as of right, and once your Southern neighbour has done that, you can build 2 storeys high up to that boundary too].	Reject	*Section 6*

S888.009	Chris Allison	Residential Zones	Amend	Request site coverage changes. [As stated in the Nelsust submission (S608): [Increase permitted] building coverage to 55% in all residential zones].	[I support] 2.3.8 Site Coverage Changes Requested [from the original Nelsust submission (S608)]. [As stated in the Nelsust submission (S608): A significant finding of the 2006 Nelson Urban Growth Strategy was to "Grow In" rather than "Grow Out". This has been misinterpreted as "Growing Up" rather than "Growing Out", but it is not the same thing and this is where we think the present plan change proposals have seriously missed what people are presently comfortable with. So along with the proposals to go too high as of right, are the proposals to have site coverages too low - Currently ranging from a low of 30% to a high of 40% and proposed only to go up to 50% in even the highest density areas. We request building coverage should be 55% in all zones - this is still allowing more than a 45% of the land to be used for vegetation].	Reject	*Section 6*
S888.010	Chris Allison	Residential Zones	Amend	Request site coverage changes. [As stated in the Nelsust submission (S608): Increase the minimum permeable landscape areas to 25% in all zones].	Refer to submission point S888.009. [As stated in the Nelsust submission (S608): Partly in response to our request in increase allowable building coverage to 55%, we asked for the % of permeable be increased. This will mean the building plus impermeable paving would be the same as the PC29 current proposals. We note permeable landscaping is easier to do now with permeable paving that looks superficially no different to regular hard paving as well as paving such as open concrete blocks with grass growing through it].	Reject	*Section 6*

S888.011	Chris Allison	Residential Zones	Amend	Include protections for existing sunlight and views of existing dwellings [inferred].	In regard to the points made in Nelsust's 2.3.10 Heritage and Views, I agree that 'if there was a requirement to show how you are not significantly affecting neighbours views, this could be massively misused to block density increases.' Very true. But as with sunlight, views often determine the orientation and internal layout of a house, so introducing a significant block to either of these will impact on the way a house functions for those who live in it. So yes, 'protecting my view' is not a blanket reason to oppose change, but removing much the sun and view of a house is far from spurious - that's how we build prison cells.	Reject	*Section 6*
S893.006	Lilia and Eugen Grab	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings be built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	We are opposed to new 'green field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification without affecting existing suburbs. Infrastructure is easier and cheaper to develop on flat land and would provide more housing without affecting neighbouring properties.	Reject	*Section 6*

S893.008	Lilia and Eugen Grab	Residential Zones	Oppose	Include Daylight and Sunlight policy statement Para RE2.3.i: The reception of daylight and sunlight to each household unit is a critical component of residential amenity that provides warmth and energy efficiency, and is vital for outdoor activities such as gardening and recreation.	Sunlight is an essential part of living in Nelson and why we chose to live on the Tāhunanui Hills. Our house has been built for the sun and for the garden to receive sun. It will be subjected to the loss of sunlight by neighbouring intensification with the following possible effects: The front of our house, which is facing north, could have 6 storey high apartments one metre from the boundary completely enclosed our property in a very high box of buildings. This could compromise our health. Hill properties like ours already have additional shading issues directly from the hill which is another reason for not having high density development on hills. The lack of sunlight could result in existing homes becoming dark and damp with associated mould and mildew. Our house could lose property value if it is surrounded on all sides by apartments. We still have a mortgage so there will be increased financial stress if this is to occur. Privacy and outlook is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Accept	*Section 6*

S897.007	Tiffany Fleetwood-Bird	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S897.008	Tiffany Fleetwood-Bird	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission points S897.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S897.009	Tiffany Fleetwood-Bird	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S897.012	Tiffany Fleetwood-Bird	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S897.014	Tiffany Fleetwood-Bird	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S897.028	Tiffany Fleetwood-Bird	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S897.027.	Reject	*Section 6*

S898.002	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend the definition of residential activity as follows: Residential Activity Means the use of land and buildings by people for living accommodation. ~~where the occupiers intend to live at the site for a period of one month or more, and will generally refer to the site as their home and permanent address; and includes accessory buildings and leisure activities.a. Accommodation offered to not more than four travellers for a daily tariff in association with a permanent resident as described above, orb. Emergency and refuge accommodation, ors~~	The definition for residential activity should be amended to align with the National Planning Standards. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S898.003	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Residential Zones	Amend	Add the following 'retirement unit' definition to Chapter 2. Retirement UnitMeans any unit within a retirement village that is used or designed to be used for a residential activity (whether or not it includes cooking, bathing, and toilet	A 'retirement unit' definition is required to acknowledge the differences from typical residential units in terms of functional and operational needs. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

FS59.006	Transpower New Zealand Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	As drafted, Transpower opposes the request to add a definition of "retirement unit", on the basis that the definition may create uncertainty about whether "retirement units" are included within the definition of "sensitive activity". However, Transpower would adopt a neutral position on this submission point if the definition of "sensitive activity" requested by Transpower under submission point s198.011 is amended to include "retirement villages", or confirmation be provided that the definition of 'sensitive activities' would continue to apply. Transpower considers that "retirement units" and retirement villages" are residential activities that are sensitive to the National Grid. However, because the plan does not include these definitions, introducing them may create uncertainty as to whether these activities are considered as "sensitive activities". WIthout clear recognition as a sensitive activity, rules that restrict development in the National Grid Yard and National Grid Subdivision Corridor may not apply to retirement units and villages. Transpower considers that this uncertainty can be addressed by including "retirement units" under the definition of "sensitive activity".	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S898.004	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend the definition of Comprehensive Housing Development as follows: Comprehensive Housing Development Means three or more residential/retirement units, located in the Residential Zone - Comprehensive Area, Standard Area and Lower Density Area only, designed and planned in an integrated manner, where all required resource and subdivision consents are submitted together, along with sketch plans of the proposed development. The land on which the proposed residential/retirement units are to be sited must form a separate	The definition for Comprehensive Housing Development should be amended to include reference to "retirement unit" (as per the below additional definition sought to be included) to acknowledge the development of these units within the Comprehensive Housing Development Area. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S898.005	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Residential Zones	Amend	Add the following 'retirement village' definition to the Proposed Plan: Retirement VillageMeans a comprehensive residential complex or facilities used to provide residential accommodation for people who are retired and any spouses or partners of such people. It may also include any of the following for residents within the complex: recreation,	The definition for retirement village should be inserted to ensure consistency with the National Planning Standards. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

FS59.007	Transpower New Zealand Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	As drafted, Transpower opposes the request to add a definition of "retirement village", on the basis that the definition may create uncertainty about whether "retirement villages" are included within the definition of "sensitive activity". However, Transpower would adopt a neutral position on this submission point if the definition of "sensitive activity" requested by Transpower under submission point s189.011 is amended to included "retirement villages". Sensitive activities are defined in PC29 as "the use of land for a childcare facility, school. residential building, or hospital". Transpower considers that "retirement units" and "retirement villages" are residential activities that are sensitive to the National Grid. However, because the plan does not include these definitions, introducing them may create uncertainty as to whether these activities are considered as "sensitive activities". WIthout clear recognition as a sensitive activity, rules that restrict development in the National Grid Yard and National Grid Subdivision Corridor may not apply to retirement villages. Transpower considers that this uncertainty can be addressed by including "retirement villages" under the definition of "sensitive activity".	Accept	*Section 6*
S898.006	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend Objective RE1 Living Style as follows: The option of a diversity of residential styles based on the differing characteristics of areas of the city, and differing community and demographic needs. Or, in the alternative: A new objective to enable the housing and care needs of the ageing population.	The RVA supports Objective RE1 as it reflects the need for a diversity of residential development consistent with the NPSUD. However, the RVA considers the objective requires amendment to reflect the evidence in its submission concerning the resource management issues relating to the ageing population. The objective needs to clearly recognise and enable the housing and care needs of the ageing population. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	*Section 6*

S898.007	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Residential Zones	Support in part	Insert New Policy in the Residential objective and Policies chapter as follows: RE1.9 - Provision of housing for an ageing population1. Enable retirement villages that:a. Provide for greater density than other forms of residential developments to enable shared spaces, services, amenities and / facilities, and affordability and the efficient provision of assisted living and care services; andb. Provide good quality on site amenity, recognising the unique layout, internal amenity and other day-to-day needs of residents as they age.2.	The policies for the Residential Zones (eg RE1.6 - 1.8) address housing supply and choice, however they do not address the particular resource management issues relating to the ageing population covered in this submission. The RVA consider that a policy to provide for and acknowledge the following should be integrated into the District Plan: - The diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons; and - The functional and operational needs of retirement villages. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S898.008	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Amend Policy RE2.9 - Quality Living Environments for Residents to recognise the unique functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	In the experience of the RVA's members, the on-site amenity needs of retirement villages are often poorly understood by Council officers. Retirement village operators are best placed to design retirement villages that meet the needs of residents. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	*Section 6*
S898.009	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Exclude retirement villages from the applicability of the Residential Design Guide within Appendix 14, opting instead to include all relevant matters within the matters of discretion specific to the retirement village activity.	The Residential Design Guide makes no specific reference to retirement villages. In the experience of the RVA's members, applying requirements designed for standards residential activities in the same manner to retirement villages gives rise to unnecessary consenting complexities (as retirement villages are a unique activity with substantially differing functional and operational needs). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S898.010	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Residential Zones	Amend	Insert three new policies are included in the Residential objective and Policies chapter, as follows:RE2.10 - Larger SitesRecognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites by providing for more efficient use of those sites.RE2.11 - Changing CommunitiesTo provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the Medium and High Density Residential Zones will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.RE2.12 - Role of Density StandardsEnable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.	In addition to the current policies for the Residential Zones, the RVA considers that the following should be considered: - A policy regarding the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites should be included in the District Plan. This policy recognises that larger sites can accommodate greater intensification while internalising environmental effects. - A policy is required that recognises the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, and that the existing character and amenity of the residential zones will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities. This policy gives effects to Objective 4 and Policy 6 of the NPSUD. - It is appropriate for the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of effects of developments as noted in the submission above. This policy provides clarity to plan users and Council officers as to the approach for assessment of environmental effects. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S898.011	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Residential Zones	Support in part	Insert a new retirement village specific rule into the General Residential, Medium Density, and High Density Residential Zone rules as follows:REr.17X Retirement VillageRer.17X.1 Permitted:A retirement village is a permitted activity provided that:a. Habitable buildings used for the activity must be connected to a community water supply and the wastewater network; andb. Stormwater from the site used for the activity must not drain to any public road, except for secondary flow purposes.Rer.17X.2 ControlledNot applicableRer.17X.3 Discretionary/Non-complyingRer.17X.3Activities that contravene Rer.17X.1.a are a non-complying activity.Rer.17X.4Activities that contravene Rer.17X.1.b are discretionary.Assessment CriteriaRer.17X.5a. The capacity and suitability of the existing reticulated network for the proposed development.b. The suitability of alternative utility networks or on-site	PC29 currently addresses retirement villages within a general residential activity rule. The RVA considers that all residential zones (General Residential, Medium Density, and High Density) should include a retirement village specific rule (reflecting the same standards required of them as other residential activities in relation to infrastructure) that provides for retirement village activities as a permitted activity, recognising that retirement villages are residential activities that are appropriate in residential zones and provide substantial benefit including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S898.012	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Residential Zones	Amend	Insert a new retirement village specific rule framework for new buildings into the General Residential, Medium Density, and High Density Residential Zone rules as follows:Rer.17XX Construction of buildings for a retirement village.Rer.17XX.1 Permitted:Not applicableRer.17XX.2 ControlledNot applicableRer.17XX.3 Discretionary/Non-complyingActivity status: Restricted DiscretionaryMatters of Discretion are limited to:1. The effects of the building design and development layout on:a. The safety of the street and any adjacent public open space; andb. The quality of the interface between the retirement village buildings and the street and any adjacent public open space;c. Adjoining sites with respect to visual dominance, daylight and sunlight, white not limiting the ability to achieve the planned built character of the zone; andd. The ability to provide efficient parking, access and servicing on the site that supports high quality living environments; ande. Effects on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network.2. When assessing the matters in (1), consider:a. The	The RVA supports restricted discretionary activity status for the construction of retirement village buildings, but considers retirement villages require their own rule and set of focused matters of discretion so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities. The RVA considers the standard relating to wheelchair access should not apply as all retirement village buildings will be designed by operators to meet the particular needs of their residents. The RVA considers the matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village. The RVA also seeks that the construction of retirement villages is precluded from being publicly and limited notified to remain consistent with how other residential activities are treated. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S898.013	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend the permitted section of REr.17F [REr.18F and REr.19F] to provide for outdoor living court requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages as follows: Rer.17F.1 Any residential unit must be provided with an outdoor living court having at least the following area and dimensions per residential unit: a. ... b. ... c. ... d. ... e. ... f. ...For retirement units:a. The outdoor living court may be whole or in part grouped cumulatively in 1 or more communally accessible locations and/or located directly adjacent to each retirement unit; andb. A	The RVA consider that as a result of retirement villages providing a range of private and communal outdoor areas, the standard must be amended to enable communal areas to count towards the amenity standard. Further, indoor living spaces are particular important for retirement village residents given their sensitivity to the elements.	Reject	*Section 6*
S898.014	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Residential Zones	Support in part	[REr.18L and REr.19L] to provide for the outlook and privacy requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages as follows: REr.17L.1 Residential units are permitted if: a. ... b. ... c. ... d. ... e. ... f. ... g. ... h. ...For retirement units, the above applies with the following modification:a. The minimum dimensions for a require outlook space are 1 metre in depth and 1 metre in width for a living area and all other habitable spaces.	In a retirement village environment multiple communal spaces are available for residents, and residents do not rely on the outlook from retirement units alone for their amenity needs. In addition, the layout of retirement villages (particularly care rooms) means that it can be difficult to comply with the proposed standard. The RVA considers amendments should be made to [the outlook and privacy rules] to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages.	Reject	*Section 6*
S898.015	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend the permitted section of REr.17M [REr.18m and REr.19M] - Glazing to the Street to provide for retirement units within the rule requirements as follows: Residential/retirement units are permitted if: a. Any residentialor retirement unit facing the public street has a minimum of 20% of the street-facing façade in the form of windows or doors. b. ... c. ... d. For the purpose of this rule, where a residential/retirement unit faces	The RVA supports Rer.17.M [REr.18m and REr.19M] and the windows to street provisions in principle which reflect the windows to street standard of the MDRS, however consider that the standard should be amended to provide for retirement units and remove the requirement for these to be provided when facing a private vehicle and pedestrian accessway.	Reject	*Section 6*

S899.007	Derek Austin	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S899.008	Derek Austin	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S899.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S899.009	Derek Austin	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S899.012	Derek Austin	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S899.014	Derek Austin	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S899.028	Derek Austin	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S899.027.	Reject	*Section 6*

S900.007	Karen Austin	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S900.008	Karen Austin	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S900.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S900.009	Karen Austin	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S900.012	Karen Austin	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S900.014	Karen Austin	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S900.028	Karen Austin	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S900.027.	Reject	*Section 6*

S901.001	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend the definition of residential activity as follows: Residential Activity Means the use of land and buildings by people for living accommodation. ~~where the occupiers intend to live at the site for a period of one month or more, and will generally refer to the site as their home and permanent address; and includes accessory buildings and leisure activities.a. Accommodation offered to not more than four travellers for a daily tariff in association with a permanent resident as described above, orb. Emergency and refuge accommodation, orc.~~	The definition for residential activity should be amended to align with the National Planning Standards. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS50.001	MGT Holdings Limited		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: All parts. MGT Holdings fully supports the RVANZ submission and, in particular, the background information providing context to that submission and the relief sought as set out within Appendix 1 of the RVANZ submission.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS56.138	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support	Accept	Kāinga Ora agrees with the submitter and would also prefer the use of the standard definition provided in the National Planning Standards.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS56.147	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support	Accept	Kāinga Ora agrees with the submitter.	Reject	*Section 6*
S901.002	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Residential Zones	Amend	Add the following 'retirement unit' definition to Chapter 2. Retirement UnitMeans any unit within a retirement village that is used or designed to be used for a residential activity (whether or not it includes cooking, bathing, and toilet	A 'retirement unit' definition is required to acknowledge the differences from typical residential units in terms of functional and operational needs. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS56.139	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought. A separate definition is not required, as a retirement unit is still a residential activity.	Accept	*Section 6*

FS59.008	Transpower New Zealand Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	As drafted, Transpower opposes the request to add a definition of "retirement unit", on the basis that the definition may create uncertainty about whether "retirement units" are included within the definition of "sensitive activity". However, Transpower would adopt a neutral position on this submission point if the definition of "sensitive activity" requested by Transpower under submission point s189.011 is amended to included "retirement villages". Sensitive activities are defined in PC29 as "the use of land for a childcare facility, school. residential building, or hospital.", or confirmation be provided that the defintion of 'sensitive activities' would continue to apply.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS50.002	MGT Holdings Limited		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: All parts. MGT Holdings fully supports the RVANZ submission and, in particular, the background information providing context to that submission and the relief sought as set out within Appendix 1 of the RVANZ submission.	Reject	*Section 6*
S901.003	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend the definition of Comprehensive Housing Development as follows: Comprehensive Housing Development Means three or more residential/retirement units, located in the Residential Zone - Comprehensive Area, Standard Area and Lower Density Area only, designed and planned in an integrated manner, where all required resource and subdivision consents are submitted together, along with sketch plans of the proposed development. The land on which the proposed residential/retirement units are to be sited must form a separate	The definition for Comprehensive Housing Development should be amended to include reference to "retirement unit" (as per the below additional definition sought to be included) to acknowledge the development of these units within the Comprehensive Housing Development Area. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

FS25.030	Port Nelson LTD		Oppose	Reject	PNL opposes the inclusion of 'retirement unit' in the definition insofar as it would then provide for a retirement village at Auckland Point School, which is located in the Port Effects Control Overlay. PNL does not support any intensification in this overlay as this area is already subject to potentially higher noise levels and intensification would increase the number of sensitive receptors. Disallow this submission insofar as it relates to the Port Effects Control Overlay.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS56.140	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought. A separate definition is not required, as a retirement unit is still a residential activity.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS50.003	MGT Holdings Limited		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: All parts. MGT Holdings fully supports the RVANZ submission and, in particular, the background information providing context to that submission and the relief sought as set out within Appendix 1 of the RVANZ submission.	Reject	*Section 6*
S901.004	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Residential Zones	Amend	Add the following 'retirement village' definition to the Proposed Plan:Retirement VillageMeans a comprehensive residential complex or facilities used to provide residential accommodation for people who are retired and any spouses or partners of such people. It may also include any of the following for residents within the complex: recreation,	The definition for retirement village should be inserted to ensure consistency with the National Planning Standards. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

FS59.009	Transpower New Zealand Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	As drafted, Transpower opposes the request to add a definition of "retirement village", on the basis that the definition may create uncertainty about whether "retirement villages" are included within the definition of "sensitive activity". However, Transpower would adopt a neutral position on this submission point if the definition of "sensitive activity" requested by Transpower under submission point s198.011 is amended to include "retirement villages". Transpower considers that "retirement units" and "retirement villages" are residential activities that are sensitive to the National Grid. However, because the plan does not include these definitions, introducing them may create uncertainty as to whether these activities are considered as "sensitive activities". Without clear recognition as a sensitive activity, rules that restrict development in the National Grid Yard and National Grid Subdivision Corridor may not apply to retirement villages. Transpower considers that this uncertainty can be addressed by including "retirement villages" under the definition of "sensitive activity".	Accept in part	*Section 6*
FS50.004	MGT Holdings Limited		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: All parts. MGT Holdings fully supports the RVANZ submission and, in particular, the background information providing context to that submission and the relief sought as set out within Appendix 1 of the RVANZ submission.	Reject	*Section 6*

S901.005	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend Objective RE1 Living Style as follows: The option of a diversity of residential styles based on the differing characteristics of areas of the city, and differing community and demographic needs. Or, in the alternative: A new objective to enable the housing and care needs of the ageing population.	The RVA supports Objective RE1 as it reflects the need for a diversity of residential development consistent with the NPSUD. However, the RVA considers the objective requires amendment to reflect the evidence in its submission concerning the resource management issues relating to the ageing population. The objective needs to clearly recognise and enable the housing and care needs of the ageing population. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	*Section 6*
FS25.031	Port Nelson LTD		Oppose in part	Reject	PNL acknowledges and supports the provision of a variety of housing choices, including for an aging population. However, in the absence of proposed wording, any new objective must be clear that not all areas of the city are appropriate for retirement villages, i.e. in the Port Effects Control Overlay which is already subject to potentially higher noise levels. Disallow this submission insofar as it is unclear how the objective would take account of the Port Effects Control Overlay.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS56.141	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support	Accept	Kāinga Ora agrees with the submitter.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS50.005	MGT Holdings Limited		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: All parts. MGT Holdings fully supports the RVANZ submission and, in particular, the background information providing context to that submission and the relief sought as set out within Appendix 1 of the RVANZ submission.	Accept	*Section 6*

S901.006	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Residential Zones	Support in part	Insert New Policy in the Residential objective and Policies chapter as follows: RE1.9 - Provision of housing for an ageing population1. Enable retirement villages that:a. Provide for greater density than other forms of residential developments to enable shared spaces, services, amenities and / facilities, and affordability and the efficient provision of assisted living and care services; andb. Provide good quality on site amenity, recognising the unique layout, internal amenity and other day-to-day needs of residents as they age.2.	The policies for the Residential Zones (eg RE1.6 - 1.8) address housing supply and choice, however they do not address the particular resource management issues relating to the ageing population covered in this submission. The RVA consider that a policy to provide for and acknowledge the following should be integrated into the District Plan: - The diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons; and - The functional and operational needs of retirement villages. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS25.032	Port Nelson LTD		Oppose in part	Reject in part	PNL supports the provision of a variety of housing choices, including for an aging population. However, any new policy must be clear that not all areas of the city are appropriate for retirement units, i.e. in the Port Effects Control Overlay which is already subject to increased noise levels. Amend the policy wording to include reference to some parts of the city being unsuitable for intensification.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS50.006	MGT Holdings Limited		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: All parts. MGT Holdings fully supports the RVANZ submission and, in particular, the background information providing context to that submission and the relief sought as set out within Appendix 1 of the RVANZ submission.	Reject	*Section 6*

S901.007	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Amend Policy RE2.9 - Quality Living Environments for Residents to recognise the unique functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	In the experience of the RVA's members, the on-site amenity needs of retirement villages are often poorly understood by Council officers. Retirement village operators are best placed to design retirement villages that meet the needs of residents. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	*Section 6*
FS25.033	Port Nelson LTD		Oppose	Reject	PNL opposes any amendment to RE2.9 which does not recognise that some parts of the city are not suitable for intensification, including via retirement villages, because of existing constraints. Disallow insofar as it does not recognise existing constraints such as Port noise.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS50.007	MGT Holdings Limited		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: All parts. MGT Holdings fully supports the RVANZ submission and, in particular, the background information providing context to that submission and the relief sought as set out within Appendix 1 of the RVANZ submission.	Accept	*Section 6*
S901.008	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Exclude retirement villages from the applicability of the Residential Design Guide within Appendix 14, opting instead to include all relevant matters within the matters of discretion specific to the retirement village activity.	The Residential Design Guide makes no specific reference to retirement villages. In the experience of the RVA's members, applying requirements designed for standards residential activities in the same manner to retirement villages gives rise to unnecessary consenting complexities (as retirement villages are a unique activity with substantially differing functional and operational needs). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS50.008	MGT Holdings Limited		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: All parts. MGT Holdings fully supports the RVANZ submission and, in particular, the background information providing context to that submission and the relief sought as set out within Appendix 1 of the RVANZ submission.	Reject	*Section 6*

S901.009	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Residential Zones	Amend	Insert three new policies are included in the Residential objective and Policies chapter, as follows:RE2.10 - Larger SitesRecognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites by providing for more efficient use of those sites.RE2.11 - Changing CommunitiesTo provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the Medium and High Density Residential Zones will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.RE2.12 - Role of Density StandardsEnable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.	In addition to the current policies for the Residential Zones, the RVA considers that the following should be considered: - A policy regarding the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites should be included in the District Plan. This policy recognises that larger sites can accommodate greater intensification while internalising environmental effects. - A policy is required that recognises the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, and that the existing character and amenity of the residential zones will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities. This policy gives effects to Objective 4 and Policy 6 of the NPSUD. - It is appropriate for the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of effects of developments as noted in the submission above. This policy provides clarity to plan users and Council officers as to the approach for assessment of environmental effects. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	*Section 6*
FS56.142	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support	Accept	Kāinga Ora agrees with the submitter and agrees that larger sites can in some cases accommodate greater intensification while internalising environmental effects.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS50.009	MGT Holdings Limited		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: All parts. MGT Holdings fully supports the RVANZ submission and, in particular, the background information providing context to that submission and the relief sought as set out within Appendix 1 of the RVANZ submission.	Accept	*Section 6*

S901.010	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Residential Zones	Support in part	Insert a new retirement village specific rule into the General Residential, Medium Density, and High Density Residential Zone rules as follows:REr.17X Retirement VillageRer.17X.1 Permitted:A retirement village is a permitted activity provided that:a. Habitable buildings used for the activity must be connected to a community water supply and the wastewater network; andb. Stormwater from the site used for the activity must not drain to any public road, except for secondary flow purposes.Rer.17X.2 ControlledNot applicableRer.17X.3 Discretionary/Non-complyingRer.17X.3Activities that contravene Rer.17X.1.a are a non-complying activity.Rer.17X.4Activities that contravene Rer.17X.1.b are discretionary.Assessment CriteriaRer.17X.5a. The capacity and suitability of the existing reticulated network for the proposed development.b. The suitability of alternative utility networks or on-site	PC29 currently addresses retirement villages within a general residential activity rule. The RVA considers that all residential zones (General Residential, Medium Density, and High Density) should include a retirement village specific rule (reflecting the same standards required of them as other residential activities in relation to infrastructure) that provides for retirement village activities as a permitted activity, recognising that retirement villages are residential activities that are appropriate in residential zones and provide substantial benefit including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS50.0010	MGT Holdings Limited		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: All parts. MGT Holdings fully supports the RVANZ submission and, in particular, the background information providing context to that submission and the relief sought as set out within Appendix 1 of the RVANZ submission.	Reject	*Section 6*

S901.011	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Residential Zones	Amend	Insert a new retirement village specific rule framework for new buildings into the General Residential, Medium Density, and High Density Residential Zone rules as follows:Rer.17XX Construction of buildings for a retirement village.Rer.17XX.1 Permitted:Not applicableRer.17XX.2 ControlledNot applicableRer.17XX.3 Discretionary/Non-complyingActivity status: Restricted DiscretionaryMatters of Discretion are limited to:1. The effects of the building design and development layout on:a. The safety of the street and any adjacent public open space; andb. The quality of the interface between the retirement village buildings and the street and any adjacent public open space;c. Adjoining sites with respect to visual dominance, daylight and sunlight, white not limiting the ability to achieve the planned built character of the zone; andd. The ability to provide efficient parking, access and servicing on the site that supports high quality living environments; ande. Effects on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network.2. When assessing the matters in (1), consider:a. The	The RVA supports restricted discretionary activity status for the construction of retirement village buildings, but considers retirement villages require their own rule and set of focused matters of discretion so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities. The RVA considers the standard relating to wheelchair access should not apply as all retirement village buildings will be designed by operators to meet the particular needs of their residents. The RVA considers the matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village. The RVA also seeks that the construction of retirement villages is precluded from being publicly and limited notified to remain consistent with how other residential activities are treated. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

FS50.011	MGT Holdings Limited		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: All parts. MGT Holdings fully supports the RVANZ submission and, in particular, the background information providing context to that submission and the relief sought as set out within Appendix 1 of the RVANZ submission.	Reject	*Section 6*
S901.012	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend the permitted section of REr.17F [REr.18F and REr.19F] to provide for outdoor living court requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages as follows: Rer.17F.1 Any residential unit must be provided with an outdoor living court having at least the following area and dimensions per residential unit: a. ... b. ... c. ... d. ... e. ... f. ...For retirement units:a. The outdoor living court may be whole or in part grouped cumulatively in 1 or more communally accessible locations and/or located directly adjacent to each retirement unit; andb. A	The RVA consider that as a result of retirement villages providing a range of private and communal outdoor areas, the standard must be amended to enable communal areas to count towards the amenity standard. Further, indoor living spaces are particular important for retirement village residents given their sensitivity to the elements.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS50.012	MGT Holdings Limited		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: All parts. MGT Holdings fully supports the RVANZ submission and, in particular, the background information providing context to that submission and the relief sought as set out within Appendix 1 of the RVANZ submission.	Reject	*Section 6*
S901.013	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Residential Zones	Support in part	[REr.18L and REr.19L] to provide for the outlook and privacy requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages as follows: REr.17L.1 Residential units are permitted if: a. ... b. ... c. ... d. ... e. ... f. ... g. ... h. ...For retirement units, the above applies with the following modification:a. The minimum dimensions for a require outlook space are 1 metre in depth and 1 metre in width for a living area and all other habitable spaces	In a retirement village environment multiple communal spaces are available for residents, and residents do not rely on the outlook from retirement units alone for their amenity needs. In addition, the layout of retirement villages (particularly care rooms) means that it can be difficult to comply with the proposed standard. The RVA considers amendments should be made to [the outlook and privacy rules] to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS50.013	MGT Holdings Limited		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: All parts. MGT Holdings fully supports the RVANZ submission and, in particular, the background information providing context to that submission and the relief sought as set out within Appendix 1 of the RVANZ submission.	Reject	*Section 6*
S901.014	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend the permitted section of REr.17.M [REr.18m and REr.19M] - Glazing to the Street to provide for retirement units within the rule requirements as follows: Residential/retirement units are permitted if: a. Any residentialor retirement unit facing the public street has a minimum of 20% of the street-facing façade in the form of windows or doors. b. ... c. ... d. For the purpose of this rule, where a residential/retirement unit faces	The RVA supports Rer.17.M [REr.18m and REr.19M] and the windows to street provisions in principle which reflect the windows to street standard of the MDRS, however consider that the standard should be amended to provide for retirement units and remove the requirement for these to be provided when facing a private vehicle and pedestrian accessway.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS50.014	MGT Holdings Limited		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: All parts. MGT Holdings fully supports the RVANZ submission and, in particular, the background information providing context to that submission and the relief sought as set out within Appendix 1 of the RVANZ submission.	Reject	*Section 6*

S902.007	John Furtak	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S902.008	John Furtak	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S902.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S902.009	John Furtak	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S902.012	John Furtak	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S902.014	John Furtak	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S902.028	John Furtak	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S902.027.	Reject	*Section 6*

S903.007	Nigel Perks	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S903.008	Nigel Perks	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S903.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S903.009	Nigel Perks	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S903.012	Nigel Perks	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S903.014	Nigel Perks	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S903.028	Nigel Perks	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S903.027.	Reject	*Section 6*

S904.007	Katherine Waide	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S904.008	Katherine Waide	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S904.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S904.009	Katherine Waide	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S904.012	Katherine Waide	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S904.014	Katherine Waide	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S904.028	Katherine Waide	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S904.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S904.037	Katherine Waide	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Require] notification of any intensification planned near existing buildings/homes. Owners must be notified and have the right of objecting	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

S905.007	David and Clare Haig	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S905.008	David and Clare Haig	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S905.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S905.009	David and Clare Haig	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S905.012	David and Clare Haig	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S905.014	David and Clare Haig	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S905.028	David and Clare Haig	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S905.027.	Reject	*Section 6*

S906.007	John Stone	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S906.008	John Stone	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S906.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S906.009	John Stone	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S906.012	John Stone	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S906.014	John Stone	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S906.028	John Stone	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S906.027.	Reject	*Section 6*

S907.007	James McNabb	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	*Section 6*
S907.008	James McNabb	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S907.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S907.009	James McNabb	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S907.012	James McNabb	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. Eg Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S907.014	James McNabb	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S907.028	James McNabb	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S907.027.	Reject	*Section 6*

S908.007	Joel Collier	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S908.008	Joel Collier	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point s908.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S908.009	Joel Collier	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S908.012	Joel Collier	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S908.014	Joel Collier	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S908.028	Joel Collier	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S908.027.	Reject	*Section 6*

S909.007	Judith Haywood	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S909.008	Judith Haywood	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S909.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S909.009	Judith Haywood	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S909.012	Judith Haywood	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S909.014	Judith Haywood	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S909.028	Judith Haywood	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S909.027.	Reject	*Section 6*

S910.007	Myron Ouston	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S910.008	Myron Ouston	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S910.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S910.009	Myron Ouston	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S910.012	Myron Ouston	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. Eg Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S910.014	Myron Ouston	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S910.027	Myron Ouston	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S910.026.	Reject	*Section 6*

S911.007	Katy (Jane) Kerby	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S911.008	Katy (Jane) Kerby	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S911.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S911.009	Katy (Jane) Kerby	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S911.012	Katy (Jane) Kerby	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S911.014	Katy (Jane) Kerby	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S911.028	Katy (Jane) Kerby	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S911.027.	Reject	*Section 6*

S912.007	Nicola Ouston	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S912.008	Nicola Ouston	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S912.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S912.009	Nicola Ouston	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S912.012	Nicola Ouston	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S912.014	Nicola Ouston	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S912.028	Nicola Ouston	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S911.027.	Reject	*Section 6*

S913.007	Melanie Scott	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S913.008	Melanie Scott	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S913.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S913.009	Melanie Scott	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S913.012	Melanie Scott	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S913.014	Melanie Scott	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S913.028	Melanie Scott	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S913.027.	Reject	*Section 6*

S914.007	Andrew Hume	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S914.008	Andrew Hume	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S914.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S914.009	Andrew Hume	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S914.012	Andrew Hume	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S914.014	Andrew Hume	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S914.028	Andrew Hume	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S914.027.	Reject	*Section 6*

S915.007	Amanda Haywood	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S915.008	Amanda Haywood	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S915.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S915.009	Amanda Haywood	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S915.012	Amanda Haywood	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S915.014	Amanda Haywood	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S915.028	Amanda Haywood	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S915.027.	Reject	*Section 6*

S916.007	Emily Morgan	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S916.008	Emily Morgan	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S916.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S916.009	Emily Morgan	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S916.012	Emily Morgan	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S916.014	Emily Morgan	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S916.028	Emily Morgan	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S916.027.	Reject	*Section 6*

S917.007	Elizabeth and Claire Woodall	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S917.008	Elizabeth and Claire Woodall	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S917.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S917.009	Elizabeth and Claire Woodall	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S917.012	Elizabeth and Claire Woodall	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S917.014	Elizabeth and Claire Woodall	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S917.028	Elizabeth and Claire Woodall	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S917.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S918.007	Michelle Sowman	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the	Refer to reasons in submission point S918.011.	Reject	*Section 6*

S918.008	Michelle Sowman	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	I strongly support the inclusion of Daylight and Sunlight policy statement Para RE2.3.i.	Accept	*Section 6*
S918.009	Michelle Sowman	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S918.012	Michelle Sowman	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S918.014	Michelle Sowman	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S918.028	Michelle Sowman	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S918.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S919.007	Gary Burns	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S919.008	Gary Burns	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S919.007.	Accept	*Section 6*

S919.009	Gary Burns	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S919.012	Gary Burns	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S919.014	Gary Burns	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S919.028	Gary Burns	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S919.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S920.007	Pauline Miller	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S920.008	Pauline Miller	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S920.007.	Accept	*Section 6*

S920.009	Pauline Miller	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S920.012	Pauline Miller	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S920.014	Pauline Miller	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S920.028	Pauline Miller	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S920.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S921.007	Saskia Roeske-Wout	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S921.008	Saskia Roeske-Wout	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S921.007.	Accept	*Section 6*

S921.009	Saskia Roeske-Wout	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S921.012	Saskia Roeske-Wout	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
S921.014	Saskia Roeske-Wout	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S921.028	Saskia Roeske-Wout	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S921.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S922.007	Rick Miller	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Information regarding the negative impacts on existing residents' enjoyment of their properties is not forthcoming in every interaction with NCC members and staff. It is 'Deceit by Omission' and has required individuals to research PC 29 to find out these aspects and share them with the wider public. Eg. (1) Loss of winter sunlight with new recession planes. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S922.008	Rick Miller	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S922.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S922.009	Rick Miller	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S922.012	Rick Miller	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*

S922.014	Rick Miller	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S922.028	Rick Miller	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S922.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S923.007	Tyler Hemi	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S923.008	Tyler Hemi	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S923.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S923.009	Tyler Hemi	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S923.012	Tyler Hemi	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. Eg Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*

S923.014	Tyler Hemi	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S923.028	Tyler Hemi	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S923.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S924.007	Shirley Burns	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S924.008	Shirley Burns	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point s924.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S924.009	Shirley Burns	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S924.012	Shirley Burns	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*

S924.014	Shirley Burns	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S924.028	Shirley Burns	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S924.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S925.007	Nicole Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S925.008	Nicole Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S925.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S925.009	Nicole Gibson	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S925.012	Nicole Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*

S925.014	Nicole Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S925.028	Nicole Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S925.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S926.007	Nathan Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S926.008	Nathan Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S926.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S926.009	Nathan Gibson	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S926.012	Nathan Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*

S926.014	Nathan Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S926.028	Nathan Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S926.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S927.007	Matthew Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S927.008	Matthew Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S927.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S927.009	Matthew Gibson	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S927.012	Matthew Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*

S927.014	Matthew Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S927.028	Matthew Gibson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S927.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S928.007	Kade Smith	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S928.008	Kade Smith	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S928.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S928.009	Kade Smith	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S928.012	Kade Smith	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*

S928.014	Kade Smith	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S928.028	Kade Smith	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S928.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S929.007	Nichola Tyree	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S929.008	Nichola Tyree	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S929.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S929.009	Nichola Tyree	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S929.012	Nichola Tyree	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*

S929.014	Nichola Tyree	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S929.028	Nichola Tyree	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S929.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S932.007	Belinda Pooley	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. Existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: Increased levels of mental health Illness, anxiety and stress. Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses. Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating. Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress. Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S932.008	Belinda Pooley	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] Daylight and Sunlight policy [explanation and reasons] at RE2.3.i of the NRMP	Refer to reasons in submission point S932.007.	Accept	*Section 6*
S932.009	Belinda Pooley	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain RE2.4.ii and amend] to add the following bracketed words: The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units (and their neighbours) have a reasonable degree of	Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.	Reject	*Section 6*
S932.012	Belinda Pooley	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure a [minimum] of two storey dwellings are built on all new green field developments. E.g. Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.	Strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*

S932.014	Belinda Pooley	Residential Zones	Oppose	Ensure that more than 4 units requires notification.	Restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S932.028	Belinda Pooley	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Introduce] more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property	Refer to reasons in submission point S932.027.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.006	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Insert new definition:Community Garden: means land used as a garden operated by a group or collective for the purpose of growing plants, vegetables or fruit on a not for profit basis and excludes any retail activity.	Kainga Ora seeks a new definition relating to Community Gardens, to enable a related permitted activity rule to be introduced in the residential and commercial zones. Community gardens provide valuable social infrastructure, particularly in intensifying urban environments.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS38.034	Small Time Developments		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: Insert new definition: Community Garden: means land used as a garden operated by a group or collective for the purpose of growing plants, vegetables or fruit on a not for profit basis and excludes any retail activity. Provision for community gardens is commended.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.008	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	[Amend the definition of Design Statement as follows:] Is a requirement of Appendix 14 and is a statement from a suitably qualified and experienced ~~urban design~~ expert that explains the design principles and concepts that have informed the subdivision or development design,	Kainga Ora recognises that good quality design is important to achieve quality living environments and a well-functioning urban environment. However, amendment is sought to remove the requirement that the design statement must be from an "urban design expert".	Accept	*Section 6*
FS38.036	Small Time Developments		Support in part	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: [Amend the definition of Design Statement as follows:] Is a requirement of Appendix 14 and is a statement from a suitably qualified and experienced urban design expert that explains the design principles and concepts that have informed the subdivision or development design, and how urban design and sustainability issues have been dealt with. Proposed plan wording is too restrictive, leading to slow progress and/or higher costs.	Accept	*Section 6*

S933.010	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Seeks the [AD10.2.i] Design Guidelines are removed from within the District Plan.	Kainga Ora opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines [AD10.2.i] in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with. Kainga Ora opposes any policy or rule approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.011	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Delete all references to the [AD10.2.i] Design Guidelines and in any requirement to meet or follow the Design Guidelines in the provisions of the Plan	Refer to reasons in submission point S933.010.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.012	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Seeks and supports [the AD10.2.i] design guidelines sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool.	[Regarding submission points S933.010 and S933.011], Kainga Ora alternatively seeks and supports design guidelines sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
FS38.037	Small Time Developments		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: Seeks and supports [the AD10.2.i] design guidelines sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool . Proposed plan wording is too restrictive, leading to slow progress and/or higher costs.	Accept	*Section 6*
S933.014	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	If the relief sought in S933.010 and S933.011 is not granted, in deleting the design guidelines and references to such guidelines in the District Plan, seeks that the [AD10.2.i] design guidelines are amended, simplified, and written in a manner that is easy to follow. The outcomes sought in the guidelines should read as desired requirements with sufficient flexibility to provide for a design that fits and works on site, rather than rules that a consent holder	If the relief sought in S933.010 and S933.011 is not granted, in deleting the design guidelines and references to such guidelines in the District Plan.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S933.015	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	If the relief sought in this submission point is not granted, Kainga Ora seeks the opportunity to review [the AD10.2.i] guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.	If the relief sought in S933.010 and S933.011 is not granted, in deleting the design guidelines and references to such guidelines in the District Plan.	Reject	*Section 6*

S933.021	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Amend Policy [DO13A.1.1 Local context and environment], as follows: Subdivision and development should relate to local topography, climate, heritage, culture, and locally distinctive materials and vegetation where possible, while being future-focussed and	Whilst Kainga Ora support the use of urban design features that support the local context, Kainga Ora consider the Policy [DO13A.1.1] too restrictive.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
FS38.039	Small Time Developments		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: Amend Policy [DO13A.1.1 Local context and environment], as follows: Subdivision and development should relate to local topography, climate, heritage, culture, and locally distinctive materials and vegetation where possible, while being future-focussed and accommodating the planned built character of the zone. Proposed plan wording is too restrictive, leading to slow progress and/or higher costs.	Accept	*Section 6*
S933.022	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain the following additional paragraphs within REd Description: REd.1, REd.3, REd.6, REd.9, REd.10 and REd.11].	Kainga Ora generally supports the proposed additional paragraphs within this section [REd Description]. Specifically, it is noted that the additions recognise that changes to the existing built urban form will occur as density increases in response to the planned urban environment.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S933.023	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend wording in REd.10 to incorporate deletion: ...~~In achieving the planned built character of the zone, development will have regard to the amenity values of existing residential sites, acknowledging that this is more challenging as the density of development increases.~~ New	Refer to reasons in submission point S933.022.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

FS38.040	Small Time Developments		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: Amend wording in REd.10 to incorporate deletion: ... In achieving the planned built character of the zone, development will have regard to the amenity values of existing residential sites, acknowledging that this is more challenging as the density of development increases. New development will support the anticipated changes to the amenity values of existing residential sites. Proposed plan wording is too restrictive, leading to slow progress and/or higher costs.	Accept	*Section 6*
S933.024	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend RE1.2 as follows: presents an acceptable ~~high~~ standard of on site and off site amenity.	Kainga Ora supports the Policy [RE1.2 Flexibility in Development], but considers the need for a 'high' standard of on and off site amenity a difficult benchmark to achieve.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS38.041	Small Time Developments		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: Amend RE1.2 as follows: presents an acceptable standard of on site and off site amenity. Agree "High" standard is a difficult and subjective benchmark to achieve. Proposed plan wording is too restrictive, leading to slow progress and/or higher costs.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.025	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Include a definition for 'building sketch plans' within the definitions section.	[Further to S933.024 and in relation to Policy RE1.2], Kainga Ora also consider that a definition for 'building sketch plans' [should be] included within the definitions.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.026	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Oppose	Delete Policy [RE1.2A.iv Residential - Comprehensive Area].	Kainga Ora consider [Policy RE1.2A.iv Residential - Comprehensive Area] is not a policy and is best translated within the rules.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.027	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend Policy [RE2.9] as follows: Enable development of existing or new sites to create an acceptable ~~high~~ standard of amenity for residents within and adjoining a development.	[With regard to Policy RE2.9 Quality Living Environments for Residents], Kainga Ora supports the need for quality urban environments but considers that high quality is a difficult and subjective threshold to achieve.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS38.042	Small Time Developments		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: Amend Policy [RE2.9] as follows: Enable development of existing or new sites to create an acceptable standard of amenity for residents within and adjoining a development. Agree "High" standard is a difficult and subjective benchmark to achieve. Proposed plan wording is too restrictive, leading to slow progress and/or higher costs.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.028	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Amend	Insert new Permitted Activity Rule [in section REr for] Community Gardens.	Kainga Ora seeks the introduction of a new Permitted Activity rule for Community Gardens, which are considered to contribute to a well-functioning urban environment, to apply across all residential zones.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.039	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amendments sought [to REr17B.1]: Development of up to three residential units on a site is a permitted activity, ~~provided that the development complies with all the permitted conditions in this Rule Table.~~	Kainga Ora supports the permitted rule (REr.17B.1) enabling up to 3 units. However, amendment is sought as compliance is concurrently tied to complying with all conditions in the "rule table". This proviso is unnecessary as compliance with each condition is separately managed through other rules.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS73.144	EQC Toka Tū Ake		Oppose	Reject	The submitter (Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities) requests removing the Rule Table which provides context for what development complies with the permitted, controlled, discretionary and restricted conditions. We disagree with the removal of reference to the Rule Table in the suggested amendments to REr17B.1 because it helps provides a clear approach to which rules apply.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.040	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain remaining rule framework at REr.17B.3.	Kainga Ora supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status (REr.17B.3) where 4 or more units are proposed, subject to meeting accessibility conditions. Kainga Ora supports the notification preclusion that applies to REr.17B.3.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S933.041	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Delete REr.17B.3 a) and b).	Kainga Ora does not support the requirement to include 10% wheelchair accessible units where 10+ units are provided for within REr.17B.[3]. Kainga Ora consider this requirement as too restrictive if not a desired option for that specific development and adds additional cost and reduction in space. Kainga Ora consider that this design aspect is best left as a choice for a developer and the market that is being targeted.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.042	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain rule [REr.17C] framework as notified, but update rule to "Building Coverage".	Kainga Ora supports this standard [REr.17C Site Coverage], which enables coverage of 40% as a Permitted Activity. Kainga Ora also support the associated RDA rule framework and associated assessment criteria where compliance is not achieved. Kainga Ora queries whether this standard should refer to "Building Coverage", rather than "site coverage" to align with PC29's new definition of "building coverage"?	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.043	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain rule [REr.17D] framework as notified, but include notification preclusions.	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.17D Front Yards] framework; but seeks amendment to include notification preclusions (both public and limited notification) where compliance is not achieved.	Accept	*Section 6*
S933.044	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support	Retain rule [REr.17E] framework as notified.	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.17E Other Yards] framework in its entirety.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S933.045	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend rule [REr.17F] to delete clause d) and e).	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.17F Outdoor Living Court] framework, including the notification preclusion statement, however, does not support clause d) or e) as this is considered too restrictive.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.046	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain rule [REr.17G] framework as notified, but include notification preclusions.	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.17G Corner Sites] framework; but seeks amendment to include notification preclusions (both public and limited notification) where compliance is not achieved, as infringement to this standard would be assessed by relevant traffic experts and notification would not benefit the consent process.	Accept	*Section 6*

S933.047	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain rule [REr.17H] framework as notified, but include notification preclusions.	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.17H Permeable landscaped area] framework; but seeks amendment to include notification preclusions (both public and limited notification) where compliance is not achieved.	Accept	*Section 6*
S933.048	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support	Retain rule [REr.17I] framework as notified.	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.17I Fences] framework in its entirety.	Accept	*Section 6*
S933.049	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support	Retain rule [REr.17J.1] framework as notified.	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.17J.1 Maximum Building Height] framework in its entirety.	Accept	*Section 6*
S933.050	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support	Retain rule [REr.17K.1] framework as notified.	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.17K.1 Daylight admission] framework in its entirety.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S933.051	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain rule framework as notified, but include notification preclusions Amendments [to REr.17L.3] sought as follows: Activities that contravene a permitted condition are restricted discretionary. Discretion is restricted to: i. effects on the quality of on-site living environments; and~~ii. privacy effects on neighbouring sites.~~	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.17L Outlook and privacy] framework; but seeks amendment to include notification preclusions (both public and limited notification) where compliance is not achieved. Kainga Ora also seeks amendment from the matters of discretion, to remove privacy effects on neighbouring sites. This standard is an onsite amenity control, with other standards managing offsite amenity outcomes (e.g. setbacks, height, height in relation to boundary controls).	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S933.052	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain rule [REr.17M] framework as notified, but include notification preclusions.	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.17M Glazing to the street] framework; but seeks amendment to include notification preclusions (both public and limited notification) where compliance is not achieved. This rule seeks to manage the interface with the street (positive design and passive surveillance) and notification would not benefit the consent process.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S933.053	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support	Retain rule [REr.17N] framework as notified.	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.17N Home Occupation] framework in its entirety.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S933.058	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain rule [REr.18C] framework as notified, but update rule to "Building Coverage".	Kainga Ora supports this standard [REr.18C Site Coverage], which enables coverage of 50% as a Permitted Activity. Kainga Ora also support the associated RDA rule framework and associated assessment criteria where compliance is not achieved. Kainga Ora queries whether this standard should refer to "Building Coverage", rather than "site coverage" to align with PC29's new definition of "building coverage"?	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.069	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend [REr.18O Non-residential activity] to incorporate community facilities.	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.076	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain rule [REr.19C] framework as notified, but update rule to "Building Coverage".	Kainga Ora supports this standard [REr.19C Site Coverage], which enables coverage of 50% as a Permitted Activity. Kainga Ora also support the associated RDA rule framework and associated assessment criteria where compliance is not achieved. Kainga Ora queries whether this standard should refer to "Building Coverage", rather than "site coverage" to align with PC29's new definition of "building coverage"?	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.086	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support	Amend [rule REr.19O Non-residential activity] to incorporate community facilities.	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S934.006	Nicholas Priest	Residential Zones	Amend	Consider implementing a maximum occupancy per residential dwelling in residential zones [inferred].	Will those who are 'built next too' face a hit on their property value? Perhaps max numbers of people per dwelling should be considered in the more residential areas?	Reject	*Section 6*
S934.012	Nicholas Priest	Residential Zones	Oppose	Care should be given to the scale of development.	Six story is huge/high in relation to Nelsons existing skyline. See reference image 1 and 2 [in the original submission]. Care should be given to the scale of development, new is not always bad some excellent examples of contemporary architecture exist in Nelson, however there is some less so. See image 5 [in the original submission].	Reject	*Section 6*

S935.002	Boffa Miskell Ltd (Nelson) (WITHDRAWN SUBMISSION 12Feb2024)	Residential Zones	Amend	Public realm response of public amenity such as improved footpaths, urban greening, seating, lighting, preservation of existing street trees etc should be strongly considered with intensification.	2. Protect and increase the area and impact of public realm amenity - Inner City and City Fringe and Residential. 2.1 Increasing the density in residential areas puts more demand on the public realm. Considerations within this plan change needs to accommodate and anticipate the increased demand on urban landscape and value of amenity for residents and the public. This is partially notable as a key characteristics of Whakatu/ Nelson is the leafy green suburbia surrounding the city. The plan needs to enable urban greening with plants, in particular trees in the right place. Urban greening as part of Nelson's identity as a response to the intensification. These areas of urban greening should happen with at the street level and be driven by a wider Urban Greenspace Spatial Plan (see consideration 2.2). With the scenario where mature trees are removed from the Public realm, there should be compensation for bringing mature trees back in. 2.2 Development of an urban greenspace spatial plan to enable successful intensification outcomes PC29 The parks network that served people and the environment in a low-density suburban living context will require investment to meet the future needs of our communities who will live in more compact intensified urban areas identified in PC 29. Our coastal fringe , waterfront, sportsfields, walkways, playgrounds and natural areas need to be complemented by a network of easy to access, quality neighbourhood parks that people use on a daily basis. Investment in quality neighbourhood parks will support the planned transition to higher density urban and suburban living across Whakatu/ Nelson. The development of PC29 and intensification areas should be responsive to; and developed in conjunction with a Parks and Open Spaces Spatial Plan. Improvements in our neighbourhood parks and pedestrian linkages will support people living well in urban areas and provide the spaces where natural environment elements, play and socialisation can be integrated	WITHDRAWN	*n/a*

S935.003	Boffa Miskell Ltd (Nelson) (WITHDRAWN SUBMISSION 12Feb2024)	Residential Zones	Amend	Undertake neighbourhood level design guidelines and planning for other areas outside the urbanized centres, (e.g. in more 'suburban' context).	3. Design Guidelines The creation of a Whakatu/ Nelson design guidelines, that look at the Neighborhood scale would work to ascertain better design outcomes. The design guides need to support good street level activation, Look at bulk and mass, articulation and modulation. For other areas outside the urbanized centres, (e.g. in more 'suburban' context), neighbourhood level design guidelines and planning should be undertaken by Council to ascertain the impacts of intensification on existing properties.	WITHDRAWN	*n/a*
S936.001	Susan Lovell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S936.002	Susan Lovell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S936.003	Susan Lovell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S936.010	Susan Lovell	Residential Zones	Amend	[Suggests] 2-3 storey apartment blocks be high quality and setback from the street and have gardens.	The quality and design of houses in Nelson is very poor. [it would be] much better to have larger developments rather than putting houses behind houses with very odd driveways.	Reject	*Section 6*
S938.004	Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ)	Residential Zones	Support	Support the General Residential zone description at DO16.1.1.ii and the reference to two storeys.	RNZ supports the General Residential Zone description. In particular it supports the direction that buildings are generally limited to two storeys as, in most cases, the height of two storey buildings do not create safety concerns with EMR in close proximity to RNZ's transmission facilities.	Accept	*Section 6*

S938.005	Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend REd.10 to reference the needs of network utilities and radiocommunication facilities as well as amenity values.	RNZ generally supports the new residential policies as notified but considers specific reference should be made to the needs of network utilities and radiocommunication facilities as well as amenity values. This will be increasingly important as the density of development increases.	Reject	*Section 6*
S938.006	Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend RE1.6 to specifically reference the needs of, and risks from, network utilities and radiocommunication facilities.	RNZ generally supports the new residential policies as notified but considers specific reference should be made to the needs of, and risks from, network utilities and radiocommunication facilities. This will be increasingly important as the density of development increases.	Reject	*Section 6*
S938.007	Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ)	Residential Zones	Support	Support REr.17J.	RNZ generally supports a maximum building height of 8m in the General Residential Zone. Buildings and structures up to 8m are unlikely to generate EMR safety concerns in close proximity to RNZ's transmission facilities.	Accept	*Section 6*
S939.001	Era and Darryl Creevey	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S939.002	Era and Darryl Creevey	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S939.003	Era and Darryl Creevey	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S943.001	Louise Francis	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6

S943.002	Louise Francis	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S943.003	Louise Francis	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the] rear and side yard setback so it is not less than 1.5 metres.	I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Reject	Section 6
S944.002	Habitat for Humanity Nelson	Residential Zones	Support	All new developments should be required to include a minimum provision of affordable and accessible housing to address the critical need in our community	Refer to reasons in submission point S944.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S947.005	Nelson City Council	Residential Zones	Support in part	Clarify the matters of control/discretion/assessment criteria for REr.17B, REr.18B, REr.19B, REr.22, REr.107 to enable consideration of ownership and maintenance of shared facilities on site.	Multi-unit developments enabled by PC29 regularly include shared facilities that require ongoing maintenance e.g. access lots, stormwater detention, acoustic fencing, landscaping, communal rubbish collection areas etc.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS57.005	Susan Hamilton and David Macdonald		Support in part	Accept	The submission details "the potential adverse effects of taller buildings on the function around amenity of public open spaces" - these include "shading of publicly accessible areas and wild effects". If it is of value to protect public reserves that are used intermittently and by choice, then it is vastly more important to protect privately owned residential properties that are lived in and enjoy the current sunshine and environment 24/7.	Accept	*Section 6*

S947.012	Nelson City Council	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend the building location provisions in REr.17 A-M, REr.18A-M, Rer.19A-M as necessary to provide for party wall exemptions.	The daylight admission rules in the General Medium and High Density Residential zones have an exclusion which states that the standard does not apply to party walls, and any new allotment boundary related to these. While this exclusion is captured in the daylight admission rules, there is no corrosponding exclusion in any of the other provisions. For example while a party wall may not need a resrouce consent under the daylight admission rule it will require a consent under the yard setback rules REr.17E, 18E and 19E.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS57.012	Susan Hamilton and David Macdonald		Support in part	Accept	The submission details "the potential adverse effects of taller buildings on the function around amenity of public open spaces" - these include "shading of publicly accessible areas and wild effects". If it is of value to protect public reserves that are used intermittently and by choice, then it is vastly more important to protect privately owned residential properties that are lived in and enjoy the current sunshine and environment 24/7.	Accept	*Section 6*
S947.013	Nelson City Council	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend standards REr.17 M, REr.18M, REr.19M and/or insert a definition of street facing façade to clarify the implementation of standard and achieve the intent of the standard.	There is a lack of clarity over the requirement for 20% glazing of street facing facades under this standard. Issues that require clarification or reconsideration include: • How the lower extent of the façade is identified, especially for dwellings on sloping sites. • Identification of which facades are 'street facing' with respect to, for example, rear sections, dwellings that front private right of ways, distance from the street and orientation on the site. While some additional clauses were inserted with Plan Change 29 to clarify the calculation of façade area with respect to areas enclosed by gables and whether garage doors can contribute towards glazing, these may require further consideration.	Accept	*Section 6*

FS57.013	Susan Hamilton and David Macdonald		Support in part	Accept	The submission details "the potential adverse effects of taller buildings on the function around amenity of public open spaces" - these include "shading of publicly accessible areas and wild effects". If it is of value to protect public reserves that are used intermittently and by choice, then it is vastly more important to protect privately owned residential properties that are lived in and enjoy the current sunshine and environment 24/7.	Accept	*Section 6*
S947.014	Nelson City Council	Residential Zones	Support in part	Consider whether the NRMP should be amended to encourage space for individual recycling bins, such as by amending matter of discretion REr.17B, REr.18B, REr.19B.	In the experience of Council staff, individual recycling bins for each residential unit result in better recycling than communal systems because of the sense of individual 'ownership' of the waste and accountability. The provision of space for storage of recycling bins is key to their use and mitigating their visual impact. As the NRMP, in turn, is a key tool influencing development design, consideration could be given to using the NRMP to encourage specifically the provision of space for individual recycling bins (over communal recycling bins) at least for less intensive housing typologies such as detached residential units and terraced housing.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS57.014	Susan Hamilton and David Macdonald		Support in part	Accept	The submission details "the potential adverse effects of taller buildings on the function around amenity of public open spaces" - these include "shading of publicly accessible areas and wild effects". If it is of value to protect public reserves that are used intermittently and by choice, then it is vastly more important to protect privately owned residential properties that are lived in and enjoy the current sunshine and environment 24/7.	Accept	*Section 6*
S90.004	Andrew & Margreet Petheram	Mapping	Oppose	Rezone [the City Fringe Zone] to [General Residential Zone]	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

S178.004	Tony No surname supplied	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Delete the] High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), that has a max height greater than 12m	I oppose the creation of a High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), that has a max height greater than 12 m as it is not mandated under NPS-UD 2020	Reject	*Section 6*
S792.004	Michelle Viskovich	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Delete the] High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), that has a max height greater than 12m.	I oppose the creation of a High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), that has a max height greater than 12 m as it is not mandated under NPS-UD 2020. Refer to reasons in submission point S792.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S810.004	Robert Bruce	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Delete the] High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), that has a max height greater than 12m.	I oppose the creation of a High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), that has a max height greater than 12 m as it is not mandated under NPS-UD 2020. Refer to reasons in submission point S810.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S53.004	Barbara-Jean Edwards	Subdivision	Oppose	Add or Increase minimum lot area, to be approved by Nelson residents.	No minimum for lots and 200m2 for lots with a residential building - this doesn't take into affect the need for water run-off, climate change, sunlight, shading	Reject	*Section 6*
S140.006	Jon Wahlberg	Subdivision	Oppose	Increase the shape factor of subdivisions adjacent to the Rural Zone, including Rural - Lower Density Small Holdings Area	Refer to reasons in submission point S140.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S140.007	Jon Wahlberg	Subdivision	Oppose in part	Seek a subdivision zone of at least 1,000m2, with a designated BLA that is setback 25m from the zone boundary.	This being consistent with the TRMP which recognises the importance of increased separation to support rural activities [Refer to reasons in submission point S140.001].	Reject	*Section 6*

S343.013	Mark Fielding	Subdivision	Amend	Prohibit subdivision around secondary minor dwellings, but allow these to be rented out to non family members.	Usage of such secondary minor dwellings would not be restricted to family members. Such could also be rented out for an income stream, which still provides for additional housing needs. A condition however would be that such a unit could not be sold and the site not permitted to be subdivided - even at some future date. Current proposals for such applications (all requiring a Resource Consent) are subjected to discretion by planning staff, who consider if the proposal as built, would meet future subdivision rules. This has no logic in my mind when a current proposal would work fine as presented if on the same property - but would be declined because it would not be possible to subdivide at some future date. Surely that would be the responsibility of the owner to agree to at the time of application. This type of thinking may have changed.	Reject	*Section 6*
S413.004	Scott Figenshow	Residential Zones	Amend	If the reclassified sleepout / residential unit satisfies all of the PC29 Standards for the Medium Density zone, and there is no minimum lot size, then a Subdivision resource consent should be a Controlled activity, with no further engineering, design or access requirements imposed.	The geotech reports and engineering performed during the construction of our sleepout should provide adquate evidence to council that the building satisfies any engineering it would require now that the area is included in the Slope Instability Area 3 Overlay. No further engineering reports should be needed. While our present family needs are satisfied by having both units on one title, a future owner may want to subdivide. PC29's changes should provide simplicity as to that path.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S467.014	Tasha Workman	Subdivision	Oppose	Adjust levies associated with subdividing larger properties	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

S560.001	Jane Bayley	Subdivision	Oppose in part	Consider a reduction in allotment size for residential zone properties adjacent to Rural zone properties [by amending rule] REr.107.2.f. [suggest a minimum nets site area of] 1000m2.	There is already a fraught balance around the Rural / Residential Boundary with no specific setbacks for building or housing. Currently along the rural boundary we often find residential people walking dogs along the rural fences or through paddocks. This scares stock and has resulted in death of animals. There is also a conflict with increased residential activity against rural boundaries in relation to shelter belt maintenance, stock noise and smell, machinery and sprays. The Council should not be encouraging the intensification of housing against the rural boundaries by having General Residential Zone against the Rural Boundary.	Reject	*Section 6*
S560.015	Jane Bayley	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Consider amending rule REr.107.2.f. to include 25m dwelling setbacks from boundaries for residential zone properties adjacent to Rural zone properties.	Refer to reasons in submission point S560.001. Council should be providing a size and shape factor against the rural boundary and dwelling setbacks to allow rural properties to be able to continue their rural activities. Something similar to TDC, being 1,000m2 with at least a 25m offset for dwelling.	Reject	*Section 6*
S560.016	Jane Bayley	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Consider amending rule REr.107.2.f. to include an amended shape factor for residential zone properties adjacent to Rural zone properties	Refer to reasons in submission points S560.001 and S560.015.	Reject	*Section 6*
S580.010	Small Time Developments	Residential Zones	Support	Support 200m2 lot size [for vacant allotments in all new residential zones REr.107].	Not stated. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	*Section 6*
FS56.082	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora opposes minimum allotment sizes and considers a shape factor of 8m x 15m to be more appropriate. Kāinga Ora supports the introduction of a rule to provide for subdivision around an approved building.	Reject	*Section 6*
S602.005	Andrew Ng	Subdivision	Not Stated	Enable residential subdivision of larger parcels of land [inferred].	In places where people live, we should not change things so drastically. We can have two-story apartments or split big lands to fit with the community.	Accept	*Section 6*
S626.012	Raine Estate Oaklands Ltd	Subdivision	Amend	Review and amend the subdivision rules [REr.107] to ensure it is individually workable, practical, effective and allow for good outcomes to be achieved	Refer to reasons in submission point S626.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
S654.009	Romneya Gammie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Make it easier and more affordable to subdivide.	None stated.	Accept	*Section 6*

S654.010	Romneya Gammie	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	[Allow more] new subdivisions.	None stated.	Accept	*Section 6*
S709.141	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Add to OSr.74.4 Subdivision Assessment criteria as follows:j. any impact the subdivision may have on public health and wellbeing such as a reduction in access to open space.	The reduction of vegetation and biodiversity in our urban areas (and their fringes) can have negative impacts on our wellbeing. Having access to green spaces is known to improve the physical and mental well-being of people living in cities. [Refer to the original submission appendix A2 - Open space for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S766.025	588 Limited	Subdivision	Oppose	Delete change [to REr.107].	While it is accepted that some residential areas are suitable for residential allotments down to 200m2, it is considered that Bayview is not one such area. This is because considerable time and resources have been invested into planning for a subdivision density and character that is sympathetic to the topography, but also planned in a coordinated manner in conjunction with the management of infrastructure constraints. This submission is made alongside those made against REr.17A, REr.17B and REr.108. [Refer to submission points S766.007 and S766.026]. These submissions must be considered collectively.	Reject	*Section 6*
S767.025	Bayview Nelson Limited	Subdivision	Oppose	Delete change [to REr.107].	While it is accepted that some residential areas are suitable for residential allotments down to 200m2, it is considered that Bayview is not one such area. This is because considerable time and resources have been invested into planning for a subdivision density and character that is sympathetic to the topography, but also planned in a coordinated manner in conjunction with the management of infrastructure constraints. This submission is made alongside those made against REr.17A, REr.17B and REr.108 [Refer to submission points S767.007, S767.008, and S767.026]. These submissions must be considered collectively.	Reject	*Section 6*

S879.004	Tasman District Council	Subdivision	Amend	Amend the subdivision and land use rules [REr.107] to disincentivize subdivision and incentivize comprehensive redevelopment of sites. Essentially, subdivision and development of land that is suitable for comprehensive redevelopment into more efficient housing typologies should be discouraged through a more difficult rule framework.	The subdivision rule REr.107 as notified allows for the subdivision of land in the Medium Density Residential Zone and the High Density Residential Zone as a controlled activity down to a minimum lot size of 200 square metres. This may result in the continuation of the fragmentation of land ownership. Land fragmentation is one of the key challenges that makes good-quality intensification more difficult. It is submitted that allowing ongoing fragmentation may make it increasingly difficult to transition to a well-functioning urban environment. In these two zones, there should be stronger incentives towards comprehensive redevelopment of sites, and barriers or disincentives to avoid undue fragmentation that will make future intensification and redevelopment harder. Retaining easy (controlled activity) subdivision on sites that are suitable for high-quality progressive intensification and achieving excellent urban design and efficient land use outcomes is not desirable. Such subdivisions would not be able to be challenged or declined and may result in significant missed opportunities that have effectively irreversible consequences (i.e. loss of large contiguous parcels of land).	Reject	*Section 6*
FS39.004	Richard Harden and Rachel Reese		Support	Accept	The issues raised in this submission point are consistent with the recommendations made by the Nelson Tasman FDS Hearing Panel to both Councils with regard to land aggregation and comprehensive development. These recommendations were resolved by both councils and I can see no record of the resolutions subsequently being revoked.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS56.130	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support in part	Accept in part	Kāinga Ora supports the incentivisation of comprehensive redevelopment of sites and agrees with the submitter that land use and subdivision rules could better incentivise this type of development. Kāinga Ora opposes minimum allotment sizes for sites within the medium and high-density zones and consider a shape factor of 8m x 15m is more appropriate. Kāinga Ora supports the introduction of a rule to provide for subdivision around an approved building. Kāinga Ora consider that REr.107 is overly complex and consider that some standards could be removed.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.031	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amendments [to REr.107] as follows: Separate out complex standards from rule into separate rules.	Kainga Ora consider that REr.107 is overly complex and consider that some standards could either be split from the rule.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
FS25.039	Port Nelson LTD		Support	Accept	PNL supports clear plan drafting and this rule in particular is complex in its current drafting. Allow this submission.	Accept	*Section 6*
S933.032	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Remove minimum allotment sizes for medium and high density zones and provide for 8m x 15m minimum shape factors only.	[With regard to REr.107], Kainga Ora oppose minimum allotment sizes for sites within the medium and high density zones and consider a shape factor of 8m x 15m is appropriate.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.033	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Remove minimum allotment sizes for medium and high density zones and provide for 8m x 15m minimum shape factors only.	[With regard to REr.107], Kainga Ora oppose minimum allotment sizes for sites within the medium and high density zones and consider a shape factor of 8m x 15m is appropriate.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.034	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Include rule for subdivision around approved buildings (or in conjunction with a land use consent).	[With regard to REr.107], Kainga Ora also support the introduction of a rule to provide for subdivision around an approved building.	Accept	*Section 6*
S10.001	Nicola Roberts	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Consider sections that would interfere with north facing properties. These are the ones where the sun will be severely impacted.	My home faces north and if a 3 story home was built in front of me I would have not one bit of sun all day. This would completely ruin my health and value of property.	Reject	*Section 6*

S21.001	Emma Newcombe	Mapping	Oppose in part	Straighten the boundary of the Medium Density Residential Zone at the southern boundary on the east of The Brook. It currently includes 87b Brook St, which projects south into the General Residential/Rural zone.	I am in general agreement that we need to cater for intensification to prevent further urban sprawl and provide more housing. I don't have a strong opinion on where the boundaries of each zone should be in a broad sense. However, the southern boundary of the Medium zone in The Brook runs up a driveway I share with 3 others. Two of these four properties fall within the Medium residential zone, and two outside it. 87b is included in the Medium zone, which means that this zone projects out to the south into the general/rural zone. This doesn't make sense to me as this property would (possibly) be able to be developed to medium density while being surrounded on 3 sides by general residential/rural. Most of the zone boundaries proposed for other parts of the city seem to have avoided being this irregular. The property at 87b may not be suitable for development, but I nonetheless would like to see a fairer outcome, and I therefore request that the boundary be made a much straighter line by removing 87b from the Medium Density zone.	Reject	*Section 6*

S23.001	Robin Holmes	Mapping	Oppose	Exclude the 87b and 87a Brook Street properties [from the Medium Density Residential Zone].	Catering for housing intensification in Nelson is important to provide more affordable homes for young families. However, the proposed southern boundary of the Medium Density zone in The Brook trisects a shared driveway with four properties into three zones. As proposed, two of these properties would be medium density, one would be general residential and a fourth zoned rural. Housing intensification if done well preserves the character of the surrounding suburb and enables a smooth transition between dwelling types. The proposed boundary would put medium density housing directly adjacent to both rural and residential areas, this would create a stark transition and a cluster of mixed of housing styles. I therefore request that the boundary be made simpler by removing 87b and 87a from the planned Medium Density zone.	Accept	*Section 6*
S26.028	Eddie Allnutt	Residential Zones	Not Stated	Support Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, providing AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S33.002	Katherine Sandston	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the Plan Change to allow 3 storey buildings adjacent to 26 Bronte Street.	Refer to reasons in submission point S33.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S36.007	Sarah-Jane Weir	Residential Zones	Oppose	Reduce the maximum building height to 7.5m, with anything higher being non-complying and subject to resource consent processes	Refer to reasons in submission point S36.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS40.005	Belinda Reburn		Support	Accept	The submission identifies the loss of amenity values (privacy, daylight, "neighbourliness') and property value. Ms Weir identifies the 2019 FDS (of 2022 FDS) and that the maximum height of buildings be 7.5m, with anything higher being non-complying and subject to Resource Consent. She further identifies FDS 2022 where consultation around community values was undertaken, the views of the community included not only quality intensification, but that natural environment and landscape are important, with some areas having a unique character that should be maintained. I concur with Ms Weir that the enablement of the current proposed plan change, would not recognise Nelson's character and importance of green spaces, trees, and biodiversity, when enabling large-scale introduction of intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS70.008	Michael and Sita Monaghan		Support	Accept	Submission supported in full.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS78.445	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission I support are: various. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences; amenity and value in the CBD and residential areas will be lost if it goes ahead.	Reject	*Section 6*
S36.008	Sarah-Jane Weir	Residential Zones	Oppose	The MDZ does not take effect until Council has further consulted on and developed appropriate provisions for Daylight Admission, Yard Setbacks, Permeable Landscape areas, and Maximum Building Length.	Intensification should take account of the reasons that residents like living here - sunlight [and] daylight access and enjoyment, are not lost for future generations. Respect of neighbours boundaries in terms of how high and how close buildings can come is important.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS70.009	Michael and Sita Monaghan		Support	Accept	Submission supported in full.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS78.446	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission I support are: various. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences; amenity and value in the CBD and residential areas will be lost if it goes ahead.	Reject	*Section 6*
S59.004	Colin Bell	Residential Zones	Amend	[Reduce] the maximum number of storeys from 3 to 2.	Refer to reasons in submission point S59.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
S59.005	Colin Bell	Residential Zones	Amend	[Retain] existing daylight angles.	Refer to reasons in submission point S59.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
S72.003	Charles Rands	Residential Zones	Oppose	Decrease the recession plane rules to 45 degrees.	The 60-degree recession plane will create very shady residential areas that will negatively affect neighbours to development and those living and working in the areas.	Reject	*Section 6*
S78.005	Jaimie Barber	Residential Zones	Support in part	[Propose the] requirement for design/aesthetic standards/covenants but with cost and producitvity in mind.	I only support well designed intensification. As such, there should be design standards/covenants for Medium Density developments but with cost and productivity in mind. The standards need to be very clear, certain and not onerous, otherwise, no one will want to take on the risk (costs) of getting rejected.	Reject	*Section 6*

S86.012	Hazel Thelin	Residential Zones	Support in part	[Establish] medium density rezoning of residential areas [based on the existing building heights in each street with] two choices [as follows;] one medium density option to have a height less than 10m for those residential streets that have existing single story subdivided allotments comprising single storey over 75% of housing. For those residential areas with existing structures at two story or higher of 75% proportion for those areas to be rezoned to medium density up to 12m.	I support in part medium density rezoning of residential areas planned but for this to be undertaken by street and by using each street's natural and built amenity indicators of what is existing as to how it is rezoned... This then maintains existing residents amenity and culture of each street. It is pretty hard on those residents who have invested wisely, buying allotment and property away from existing flood zones and existing low lying lands near watercourses and away from the coast and have not bought on unstable ground and then to have their wise choice maximised by others and rezoned to an intolerable high density or to have a medium density structure built of 12m in height next to their single story building consented structure built to the existing planning rules. These residents would then be living with less natural light, less natural views and their privacy reduced by onlooking windows, reduction in off street parking and their area to be more congested to live in and services and infrastructure shared to breaking point. Two options would create a staged planning approach for all residential zones whereby each medium density intensification of each street in this relatively small city can be assessed, and this can be reviewed in 50 years and further rezoning may be warranted but would be more in keeping with the staged two option medium density approach applied to maintain culture, amenity and respects the fact that most kiwis nest eggs are the home they live in and profound planning changes disrespect residents who have undertaken building works to planning and building rules of the time. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S92.001	Paul Nicholson	Residential Zones	Amend	Limit apartment buildings to no more than three (3) two-story units with a total height of 8m.	Any buildings taller than 8m would detrimentally impact the character of all our medium density neighbourhoods as well as severely reducing the sunlight available to residences in the zone People are like plants - they need sunlight to thrive!	Reject	*Section 6*

S92.008	Paul Nicholson	Residential Zones	Amend	Reduce the proposed Recession Plane from 60 degrees to 25 degrees.	REr.18B.4 b (i) specifies that the approval process must "optimise sunlight access." A 60 degree plane will never accomplish such optimisation.	Reject	*Section 6*
S92.010	Paul Nicholson	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Retain the current stipulation that every residential property has the right to a minimum of two (2) hours of sunlight at mid-winter, and ensure that new developments cannot erode	People and plants need sunlight to thrive, and Nelson is the place to which people have moved to get the most amount of sun.	Reject	*Section 6*
S92.011	Paul Nicholson	Residential Zones	Amend	Rear and Side yard setbacks should be no less than 1.5 metres.	Setbacks of less than 1.5 metres would lead to a sense of overcrowding and the loss of essential sunlight.	Reject	*Section 6*
S94.008	William Rush	Residential Zones	Support in part	Allow up to 3 storey houses (11m) in the Medium Density Residential Zone but amend the daylight admission rule for side and rear boundaties so that it is the same as the General Residential Zone (i.e., 3m + 45°).	I think the proposed Daylight admission rules will have a detrimental effect on some neighbouring houses and I think this rule should be amended for rear and side boundaries so that it is the same as the General Residential Zone (i.e., 3m + 45°).	Reject	*Section 6*
S110.001	Colin Gylstra	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Reduce] the maximum height of the medium-density zone to two storeys.	The medium-density zone should not be more than two storeys, with some setbacks for light-level maintenance. At three storeys as proposed, the neighbouring properties will lose a lot of sunlight and appeal. It is misleading to claim only 15% of properties in this zone will be developed in ten years. This doesn't consider the 15% of properties on each side, and behind that will be detrimentally affected. That adds up to 45%, plus, with the properties on the diagonal at the rear of the developed properties, the number of properties affected is over 60%. These figures apply to the left side of Main Road Stoke, heading towards Richmond. The impact of the right-hand side is a little less, but still very significant. Keeping the height to 2 storeys but allowing three dwellings per residential title would still significantly increase residential density.	Reject	*Section 6*
S110.002	Colin Gylstra	Residential Zones	Support in part	[Allow] three dwellings per title.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S110.001.	Accept	*Section 6*

S131.005	Diane Chandler	Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove the permitted activity status for 3,4,5,6 storey buildings in existing residential areas of predominantly single or two storey buildings.	Multi storey buildings - 3,4,5,6 storey buildings should not be permitted in existing residential areas of predominantly single or two storey buildings. If multi storey buildings are developed in an area of single house zone, that cannot realistically be said to be predominantly in accordance with the character of the area and compromises existing residents daylight, sunlight, privacy and quiet enjoyment of their homes. We can have infill without negatively affecting current residents privacy, sunlight, daylight and quiet enjoyment of their homes. It should never be a matter of new housing over current residents. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S137.004	Sherrilyn Spilman	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Require public notification for resource consent applications proposing buildings over 2 storeys in height in hte residential zones [inferred].	Above that height, the proposed buildings need to be notified activities, open to opposing views. Neighbourhoods need to be consulted about any proposed developments which could have a considerable influence of them.	Reject	*Section 6*
S159.001	Alesha Breading(nee Phipps)	Mapping	Oppose	[Request that we are] able to choose if we are in a General or Medium Density Residential zone.	When less that 2 houses away I feel we should be able to question, and choose if we are in general or medium density zone (I personally would feel a lot happier even being in the general zone).	Reject	*Section 6*
S196.001	Sarah Varey	Residential Zones	Amend	Approve the Plan Change with amendments to the Daylight angles [to retain existing daylight angles] for the MDZ zones.	We have an issue in NZ with cold, damp houses, and for the health of neighbours, their access to sunlight needs to be preserved. Put up a sunlight-blocking dwelling next door, and they immediately need to increase their heating and deal with clothes drying with a drier. To minimise this healthy requirement for living is to deny the reality that almost every house is orientated to maximise its sunlight. If it wasn't an issue, no one would bother. I don't have anything to say about the HDZ, and I think it is an excellent idea to promote residential living in the city centre.	Reject	*Section 6*

S197.006	Adrian Parlane	Residential Zones	Amend	[Amend the residential zoning to] just two zones - General Residential and Medium Density, with the ability to go higher than 12 metres on specific sites but only after adequate consultation on a case-by-case basis.	The development of medium density housing would be random around Stoke as properties become available so 3 storey 12 metre housing blocks would be popping up through suburbia. Surely site-specific zones would be preferable, keeping like with like. E.g. Ernest Rutherford Village and Nelson Junction.	Reject	*Section 6*
S216.001	Cathie Fearey	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the plan to not] allow 3 story buildings in the medium density zone.	So many of us living in Stoke are here because of the sun and the space around the houses to have a garden, a fruit tree and lawn for the kids to kick a ball. You allow 3 storied houses 1meter from the boundary and the sun and quality of life diminishes hugely. We talk of healthy homes. Shade makes that much more difficult. We also need privacy and a third story peering into my living space which is 2 meters away or down on my family bbq is intimidating. I'm already experiencing that lack of privacy from our neighbor's second story.	Reject	*Section 6*
S251.003	Susan Corry	Residential Zones	Support in part	[Approve] rules REr.18A to RER.18J - that the maximum is three residential units with height of three stories (11m).	I think it is good to encourage denser development, to create a medium density zone and encourage up to three dwellings per site, either as a complete new development, or just allowing a family to add an extra dwelling for a family member etc.	Accept	*Section 6*

S251.004	Susan Corry	Residential Zones	Oppose	Delete REr.18K Daylight Admission in the Medium Density Residential zone and replace it with a new outcome based rule which protects neighbours existing sunlight (eg shall not reduce an existing properties sunlight to less than than 2-5 hours of direct sunlight between the hours of 9-3 during worst winter months, as proven by shadow diagrams..	Development is still allowed and encouraged, but not to the disadvantage or the 'daylight robbery' of existing surrounding properties/houses. I believe a 60 degree recession angle plan as a permitted angle is too steep an angle, and does not adequately protect existing properties sunlight and will create too much shade on neighbouring properties. From what I can find off Goggle, NZ sunlight reaches approximate maximum of 29 degrees above horizon in winter, and 75 degrees above horizon in summer. Thus, in winter the shade shadow generated by an 11m high building, with sun at 29-30 degrees, extends to 18-19 metres behind it (assuming assuming north facing flat section and sun due north midday, neighbours due south). With a 60deg recession angle an 11m building would only need a 4-5m distance set back from southern boundary. Studies have shown that people need natural light, natural sunlight, and if a new development comes along and blocks that it is: a) not fair on existing homeowner property rights; b) not good for our houses and physical wellbeing - cold houses create damp, create extra health issues, create extra heating costs etc; c) not good for our mental wellbeing. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS20.001	Tim Bayley		Support in part	Accept in part	She is right on here but just has her daylight angles wrong they are way worse than she states.	Reject	*Section 6*
S269.006	Lew Metcalfe	Mapping	Oppose	Delete the MRZ zone [and apply] the General Residential Zone (GRZ) Policies and Rules to beyond the Inner City and Inner City Fringe	Refer to reasons in submission point S269.005.	Reject	*Section 6*
S284.002	Alison and David Mountfort	Mapping	Oppose	If PC29 is not rejected, seek either that the Mount St Hill retain the Residential zoning from the existing NRMP, or that it include the area in the existing Lower Density area in the NRMP. That the zoning not be changed to General Residential. That the zoning of the Mount St Hill	Refer to reasons in submission points S284.001.	Reject	*Section 6*

S322.001	Cathy Nicholson	Residential Zones	Amend	Limit residential buildings to no more than three (3) two-story units with a total height of 8m.	Any buildings taller than 8m would detrimentally impact the character of neighbourhoods as well as severely reducing the sunlight available to residences in the zone.	Reject	*Section 6*
S322.009	Cathy Nicholson	Residential Zones	Amend	Reduce the proposed Recession Plane from 60 degree to 25 degrees.	Under the current planning rule there is a requirement for a Recession Plane to be at 25 degrees. This provides homes the opportunity to have an adequate amount of sunlight for healthy living as supported by many medical studies. Yet, the new plan change will limit us on sunlight by changing the plan to 60 degrees. My understanding, from the planning team, is the change was made because tall buildings could not be built under the current requirements. This is not an acceptable justification for a change that could have such a severe impact on many of our residential areas. This change will drastically impact one the main reasons why people move to Nelson, from all over the world - it is the sunniest place in NZ.	Reject	*Section 6*
S322.010	Cathy Nicholson	Residential Zones	Amend	[Request] rear and side setbacks should be no less than 1.5 metres.	A decrease in the setbacks from 1.5 meters to 1 meter will cause the loss of light to a neighbouring property. The current plan is already providing for a tight crowding of houses and this Plan will dramatically worsen the situation.	Reject	*Section 6*
S325.010	Ken Clapcott	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Support medium and highresidential zoning in Nelson and medium residential zoning in Stoke. However, [amend the] rules, especially in relation to sunlightangles and parking. Christchurch's medium density rules seem moreappropriate.	Support medium and high residential zoning in Nelson and medium residential zoning in Stoke. However, believe the associated rules, especially in relation to sunlight angles and parking should be revisited. Christchurch's medium density rules seem more appropriate. NCC are on the right track. Use Christchurch as a case study of what's working and what's not. They are 10+ years ahead of housing intensification due to earthquake rebuild.	Reject	*Section 6*

S329.033	Inea Yoon	Mapping	Oppose	[Rezone] the medium density zoning in the area on Wellington Street, Mount Street, Konini Street, etc to [General Residential Zone] housing.	Object to the medium density zoning of the area on Wellington Street, Mount Street, Konini Street etc. This should remain low density housing for the steep terrain and dangerous outcomes should PC 29 come through. Please see Alison and David Mountfort's submission which we completely agree with as it is thorough and professionally written.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S334.006	Fiona Hosie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to ensure that any non-compliance with Rules REr.18J (as to height) and/or REr.18K (as to daylight admissions) be considered as "non-complying" - and not as	I oppose the inclusion of "restricted discretionary" in the PC29 in relation to any residential zone.	Reject	*Section 6*
S334.007	Fiona Hosie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to ensure that failure to comply strictly with all other Rules in Rules REr.18 set out in PC29 will make the proposal "non-complying"	I oppose the inclusion of "restricted discretionary" in the PC29 in relation to any residential zone.	Reject	*Section 6*
S352.002	Derek & Karen Austin	Residential Zones	Amend	Remove Section C and Section D so that height of buildings does not exceed 11 metres in residential areas.	We oppose Section D or Section C regarding the maximum height of buildings being between 11 and 19.5 metres.	Reject	*Section 6*
S352.006	Derek & Karen Austin	Residential Zones	Oppose	We seek that NCC remove the developers "As of Right" clause to build Medium Density Zone and High Density Zone in residential areas.	We oppose NCC's Plan Change 29 because it permits developers "As of Right" to build Medium Density Zone and High Density Zone in residential areas. The reasons are because of extreme loss of amenities such as sunlight, privacy and views.	Reject	*Section 6*
S352.011	Derek & Karen Austin	Mapping	Amend	[Rezone MDZ to GRZ].	We would support [the plan change] if MDZ became GRZ.	Reject	*Section 6*
S361.003	Michael Scott	Residential Zones	Support in part	RE1.7 - Amend the policy to read "...with supporting small scale commercial activities and access to quality public open space."	The southern end of Nelson South currently only has one small area zoned public open space. This area is directly next to Nelson South Kindergarten and is completely surrounded by houses. The area has no passive surveillance and is not an area that people feel naturally inclined to linger in. With the wider area to be rezoned to Medium density residential, the population of the neighbourhood will increase substantially and areas of private public space will be reduced. It is important that the policy framework acknowledges that public open space will become even more important.	Accept	*Section 6*

S362.001	Beverley Webster	Mapping	Oppose	[Amend the zoning] of the Chamberlain Street neighbourhood to General Residential, rather than Medium or High Density.	1. Some of our neighbourhood have hazard identification overlays on council files that indicate risk of slip damage. Last year there were two slips on Tosswill Road, closing access into the neighbourhood near the area designated for high density housing in the plan. In recent years slips near Atarau Way resulted in a river of mud flowing down Chamberlain Street. 2. We have recently had speed humps installed on our road as the traffic density from the overflow from Tahunanui drive was not safe, due to the winding and narrow nature of our roads. Higher density thresh holds would exacerbate this situation. We do not have easy access to amenities due to the high volume of traffic on Tahunanui drive and those who do not enjoy moderate fitness would not manage the hill if walking. We no longer have a bus with easy access unless you are fit enough to walk up and down the hill. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	*Section 6*

FS61.068	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- 1. Some of our neighbourhood have hazard identification overlays on council files that indicate risk of slip damage. Last year there were two slips on Tosswill Road, closing access into the neighbourhood near the area designated for high density housing in the plan. In recent years slips near Atarau Way resulted in a river of mud flowing down Chamberlain Street. 2. We have recently had speed humps installed on our road as the traffic density from the overflow from Tahunanui drive was not safe, due to the winding and narrow nature of our roads. Higher density thresh holds would exacerbate this situation. We do not have easy access to amenities due to the high volume of traffic on Tahunanui drive and those who do not enjoy moderate fitness would not manage the hill if walking. We no longer have a bus with easy access unless you are fit enough to walk up and down the hill. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Unsuitability of land on Tahunanui hills and poor current infrastructure not meeting needs, let alone HDZ - totally unsuitable area.	Accept	*Section 6*

FS72.072	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- 1. Some of our neighbourhood have hazard identification overlays on council files that indicate risk of slip damage. Last year there were two slips on Tosswill Road, closing access into the neighbourhood near the area designated for high density housing in the plan. In recent years slips near Atarau Way resulted in a river of mud flowing down Chamberlain Street. 2. We have recently had speed humps installed on our road as the traffic density from the overflow from Tahunanui drive was not safe, due to the winding and narrow nature of our roads. Higher density thresh holds would exacerbate this situation. We do not have easy access to amenities due to the high volume of traffic on Tahunanui drive and those who do not enjoy moderate fitness would not manage the hill if walking. We no longer have a bus with easy access unless you are fit enough to walk up and down the hill. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Unsuitability of land on Tahunanui hills and poor current infrastructure not meeting needs, let alone HDZ - totally unsuitable area.	Accept	*Section 6*

FS60.064	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- 1. Some of our neighbourhood have hazard identification overlays on council files that indicate risk of slip damage. Last year there were two slips on Tosswill Road, closing access into the neighbourhood near the area designated for high density housing in the plan. In recent years slips near Atarau Way resulted in a river of mud flowing down Chamberlain Street. 2. We have recently had speed humps installed on our road as the traffic density from the overflow from Tahunanui drive was not safe, due to the winding and narrow nature of our roads. Higher density thresh holds would exacerbate this situation. We do not have easy access to amenities due to the high volume of traffic on Tahunanui drive and those who do not enjoy moderate fitness would not manage the hill if walking. We no longer have a bus with easy access unless you are fit enough to walk up and down the hill. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Unsuitability of land on Tahunanui hills and poor current infrastructure not meeting needs, let alone HDZ - totally unsuitable area.	Accept	*Section 6*
S372.002	Evan McKenzie	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Require a 3 level residential building to be subject to resource consent and require that there be no deleterious effects on neighbouring properties in terms of daylight, visual amenity, etc	Even 3 level buildings of 12m will have detrimental effects and tighter planning and consenting rules around these should be incorporated into the Plan Change.	Reject	*Section 6*
S378.002	Seymour Avenue Residents - c/o	Mapping	Oppose	[Rezone] the entirety of Seymour Avenue as a General Residential Zone.	Zoning the majority of Seymour Avenue as a Medium Density Residential Zone (allowing up to three dwellings of up to three stories on a single site REr.18B) does not protect the Precincts' historic heritage, it does not ensure that Council's obligations have been met in this regard (as a matter of National Importance) and does not retain or enhance the heritage precinct.	Accept	*Section 6*

FS65.141	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support are: [Rezone] the entirety of Seymour Avenue as a General Residential Zone. Reasons include (please also refer to our original submission #831 as in many cases multiple reasons have been noted): PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources A new study on effects of proposals on heritage and character of City is required. The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS78.151	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: [Rezone] the entirety of Seymour Avenue as a General Residential Zone. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A comprehensive independent study of the effects of this proposal on the character and heritage buildings of Nelson that informs changes to proposed rules and policies (on and off-site height, boundary set back, daylight angles) is required. The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice.	Accept	*Section 6*
S378.004	Seymour Avenue Residents - c/o	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Exclude the properties within and adjoining the Seymour Avenue Heritage Precinct from rule [REr. 18B].	Providing a rule that enables up to three dwellings of up to three stories on a single site for the properties within or adjacent to the Seymour Avenue Heritage Precinct does not protect the Precincts' historic heritage, it does not ensure that Council's obligations have been met in the protection of historic heritage and it does not retain or enhance the heritage precinct	Accept	*Section 6*

FS65.143	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support are: Exclude the properties within and adjoining the Seymour Avenue Heritage Precinct from rule [REr. 18B]. Reasons include (please also refer to our original submission #831 as in many cases multiple reasons have been noted): PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new study on effects of proposals on heritage and character of City is required. The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice. It has been undertaken by one person rather than a multidisciplinary team.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS78.153	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Exclude the properties within and adjoining the Seymour Avenue Heritage Precinct from rule [REr. 18B]. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A comprehensive independent study of the effects of this proposal on the character and heritage buildings of Nelson that informs changes to proposed rules and policies (on and off-site height, boundary set back, daylight angles) is required. The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice.	Accept	*Section 6*
S378.005	Seymour Avenue Residents - c/o	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Exclude the properties within and adjoining the Seymour Avenue Heritage Precinct from rule [REr. 18T].	Providing a rule that enables up to three dwellings of up to three stories on a single site for the properties within or adjacent to the Seymour Avenue Heritage Precinct does not protect the Precincts' historic heritage, it does not ensure that Council's obligations have been met in the protection of historic heritage and it does not retain or enhance the heritage precinct.	Accept	*Section 6*

FS65.144	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support are: Exclude the properties within and adjoining the Seymour Avenue Heritage Precinct from rule [REr. 18T]. Reasons include (please also refer to our original submission #831 as in many cases multiple reasons have been noted): PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new study on effects of proposals on heritage and character of City is required. The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice. It has been undertaken by one person rather than a multidisciplinary team.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS78.154	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Exclude the properties within and adjoining the Seymour Avenue Heritage Precinct from rule [REr. 18T]. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A comprehensive independent study of the effects of this proposal on the character and heritage buildings of Nelson that informs changes to proposed rules and policies (on and off-site height, boundary set back, daylight angles) is required. The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice. It has been undertaken by one person rather than a multidisciplinary team.	Accept	*Section 6*
S379.010	Carole-Ann Lewis	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Retain existing building] height and daylight provisions.	Buildings should be no more than 8m in the medium density zone. Also attention should be made to the sun light angles.	Reject	*Section 6*
S391.001	Thomas Croker	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Reduce the housing density in the Medium Density Residential zone from 3 units per site to 2 units	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S391.003	Thomas Croker	Residential Zones	Oppose	Reduce the height restriction of 12m (3 storeys) in the Medium Density Residential zone to 8m (2 storeys)	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

S401.001	Craig Welsh	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Replace] the Medium Density Residential Zone between Rangiora Terrace and Chamberlain Street with the General Residential Zone.	Various issues associated with high rise building on steep topography. Stormwater runoff issues. Steep topography means people generally will use vehicles (as opposed to walking to buses or biking) as main means of transportation. There is already very limited on site parking due to lack of space/topography. Parking issues will be significant (Rangiora Terrace is already clogged with on street parking). Stormwater and wastewater reticulation issues. Loss of sunlight - this area is in the Lee of the morning sun as it is. High rise buildings will result in significant loss of sunlight. Earthquake risks from highrise buildings on steep slopes. The land is expensive and developing steep land is expensive - meaning that uptake by developers will be unlikely in the medium term (next ten years) - this is relevant as the goal is expand housing development now.	Accept	*Section 6*

FS61.133	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Various issues associated with high rise building on steep topography. Stormwater runoff issues. Steep topography means people generally will use vehicles (as opposed to walking to buses or biking) as main means of transportation. There is already very limited on site parking due to lack of space/topography. Parking issues will be significant (Rangiora Terrace is already clogged with on street parking). Stormwater and wastewater reticulation issues. Loss of sunlight - this area is in the Lee of the morning sun as it is. High rise buildings will result in significant loss of sunlight. Earthquake risks from highrise buildings on steep slopes. The land is expensive and developing steep land is expensive - meaning that uptake by developers will be unlikely in the medium term (next ten years) - this is relevant as the goal is expand housing development now. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support :- Tahunanui hillside not suitable for medium or high density development for reason stated above, should be rezoned as General.	Accept	*Section 6*

FS72.136	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Various issues associated with high rise building on steep topography. Stormwater runoff issues. Steep topography means people generally will use vehicles (as opposed to walking to buses or biking) as main means of transportation. There is already very limited on site parking due to lack of space/topography. Parking issues will be significant (Rangiora Terrace is already clogged with on street parking). Stormwater and wastewater reticulation issues. Loss of sunlight - this area is in the Lee of the morning sun as it is. High rise buildings will result in significant loss of sunlight. Earthquake risks from highrise buildings on steep slopes. The land is expensive and developing steep land is expensive - meaning that uptake by developers will be unlikely in the medium term (next ten years) - this is relevant as the goal is expand housing development now. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support :- Tahunanui hillside not suitable for medium or high density development for reason stated above, should be rezoned as General.	Accept	*Section 6*

FS60.127	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Various issues associated with high rise building on steep topography. Stormwater runoff issues. Steep topography means people generally will use vehicles (as opposed to walking to buses or biking) as main means of transportation. There is already very limited on site parking due to lack of space/topography. Parking issues will be significant (Rangiora Terrace is already clogged with on street parking). Stormwater and wastewater reticulation issues. Loss of sunlight - this area is in the Lee of the morning sun as it is. High rise buildings will result in significant loss of sunlight. Earthquake risks from highrise buildings on steep slopes. The land is expensive and developing steep land is expensive - meaning that uptake by developers will be unlikely in the medium term (next ten years) - this is relevant as the goal is expand housing development now. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support :- Tahunanui hillside not suitable for medium or high density development for reason stated above, should be rezoned as General.	Accept	*Section 6*

S413.001	Scott Figenshow	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain the notified provisions, including the Medium Density Residential zone as they relate to 17 Arrow Street. Particularly including the following rules: Units per site, Height, Site Coverage, Minimum site area, Daylight Admission, Permeable Landscape Area, Outdoor Living Court, Yard Setbacks, Outlook Spaces, Glazing to the street, Maximum Building Length, Residential Unit minimum size.	We generally support the residential intensification goals and objectives of PC29. We offer the example of 17 Arrow Street, Washington Valley as a test of whether the proposed rules will achieve the intented outcomes. Our site is within easy walking distance of the town centre, and the frequent eBus service on Washington Road; this is exactly where medium density living should be located. From our experience we agree that the existing plan rules have unnecessary barriers to owners performing good quality residential intensification. For PC29 to effectively encourage intensification, then it needs to be clear and easy to comply. [Refer to the original submission for further details.]	Reject	*Section 6*
S413.007	Scott Figenshow	Residential Zones	Support in part	Consider keeping existing daylight admission standards for sites on south facing slopes.	A reason for our general support of the new daylight admission standard is that our site is generally North-facing, with Arrow Street in a valley whose low point is to the north and rises to the south. This means most all of the existing sections can easily absorb the building heights allowed by PC29 without creating a shading problem for neighbours. The slope of each site essentially absorbs the impact of the height, as the southerly neighbour will still have sun as they are higher up, even with a higher building next door. Those opposing PC29 with South-facing sites may well face shading resulting from additional height next door. Council may wish to consider keeping the existing daylight admission rules for such sites.	Reject	*Section 6*
S419.003	John Karolyi	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Oppose] the 23m from the road boundaryrestrictions.	The 23m from the road boundary restrictions doesn't allow rights for buildings already placed behind the new oversize buildings by virtue that 11m or 19.5m tall buildings at a 60 degree recession plane effectively constrains all sun. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	*Section 6*

S431.004	Bruce Mutton	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Strengthen rules around reducing shadow and ensuring penetration of sunlight, provision of outdoor spaces and onsite storage. Include additional (or different) rules in the MRZ and HRZ to ameliorate effects on existing residential units.	The new rules control the height of buildings in relation to their distance from the side and rear boundaries. However these proposed rules will result in undue shading to existing low-rise residential units. Suggest in addition rules be added to control the height of proposed buildings in relation to existing residential units on neighboring buildings to the east, south and west. A starting point for consideration could be the existing rules that apply from property boundaries (ie 2.5 m plus recession angles), but instead applying them from the exterior walls of existing units on neighbouring properties. This would mitigate the potential to have six storey buildings adjacent to single storey units, and would instead encourage graduated transitions in building height. A disadvantage of this approach is that it will slow the rate of intensification.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S448.009	Anne and Andrew Weir	Residential Zones	Oppose	Nearby property owners should always be notified when a medium or high density development is proposed and those owners should always have the right to require the developer obtain resource consent for the development.	The proposed rules for medium and high density zones do not give enough protection to the sunlight, views and privacy of existing property owners. This would allow green fields development to proceed but would give some protection and certainty for existing residents.	Reject	*Section 6*
S452.004	Claire McKenzie	Residential Zones	Support	Support medium density building heights of up to 3 storeys as permitted [inferred].	I am happy to see medium density having up to 3 storeys.	Accept	*Section 6*
S455.041	Philippa Hoult	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to ensure that any non-compliance with Rules REr.18J (as to height) and/or REr.18K (as to daylight admissions) be considered as "non-complying" - and not as	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S455.043	Philippa Hoult	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to ensure that failure to comply strictly with all other Rules in Rules REr.18 set out in PC29 will make the proposal "non-complying"	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S460.014	Richard Brudvik-Lindner	Mapping	Amend	Consider medium density for all properties not already designated as high density in the area bordered QE II Drive to Trafalgar St to Grove St to Milton/Atawhai Dr to Hardy St East to Botanical Hill to Nile St to Harper St to Bronte St to Wellington St to Gloucester St to	Refer to reasons in submission point S460.013.	Reject	*Section 6*

S460.015	Richard Brudvik-Lindner	Residential Zones	Amend	Allow 3 storey residential buildings in most areas of the urban fringe.	Yes, we should have 3-story residential buildings in most areas of the urban fringe, and yes, we should have 6-story buildings in the city core, and we should also allow some combination of 3-6 story building in places where they abut hillsides (like along Milton St/Atawhai, along Tahunanui Drive, Rocks Rd & Haven Rd; in select locations along Waimea Rd/Rutherford; & along the Ridgeline, along SH6 in Atawhai, etc). A major component of this intensification effort should be urban infill. I think NCC should make more sections and streets medium density with 3 stories (including the streets I live at the corner of) throughout the city fringe area and along more arterial roads (including some that may not be officially characterised as arterials but function as small-scale arterials). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	*Section 6*
FS25.014	Port Nelson LTD		Oppose	Reject	PNL opposes any intensification in areas subject to the Port Effects Control Overlay as this area is already subject to potentially higher noise levels and intensification would increase the number of sensitive receptors. Disallow this submission insofar as it relates to any properties within the Port Effects Control Overlay.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS28.132	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Allow 3 storey residential buildings in most areas of the urban fringe e.g. Tahuna Drive. Allowing 3 story residential activities as a permitted activity within some parts of the urban fringe e.g. Tahuna Drive, is not appropriate in particular those areas subject to the Nelson Airport Overlays which is specifically in place to manage the effects of from the airport on sensitive activities and minimise the potential for the intensification of sensitive activities within these areas due to their incompatibility.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS61.050	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The Particular Part of the submission I oppose/:- we should also allow some combination of 3-6 story building in places where they about hillsides (like along Milton St/Atawhai, along Tahunanui Drive, Rocks Rd & Haven Rd. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my opposition:- Parts of Tahunanui Drive, all of Rocks Rd and parts of Haven Road, saw some of the biggest slips in our recent rain event August '22. Rocks Road is not considered in the PC29 by NCC due to the Slump zone overlay. I do query whether the submitter has got confused with Wakefield quay v's Rocks Rd?	Reject	*Section 6*
FS72.054	Jude Osborne		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The Particular Part of the submission I oppose/:- we should also allow some combination of 3-6 story building in places where they about hillsides (like along Milton St/Atawhai, along Tahunanui Drive, Rocks Rd & Haven Rd. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my opposition:- Parts of Tahunanui Drive, all of Rocks Rd and parts of Haven Road, saw some of the biggest slips in our recent rain event August '22. Rocks Road is not considered in the PC29 by NCC due to the Slump zone overlay. I do query whether the submitter has got confused with Wakefield quay v's Rocks Rd?	Reject	*Section 6*

FS60.046	Tahunanui Community Hub		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The Particular Part of the submission I oppose/:- we should also allow some combination of 3-6 story building in places where they about hillsides (like along Milton St/Atawhai, along Tahunanui Drive, Rocks Rd & Haven Rd. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my opposition:- Parts of Tahunanui Drive, all of Rocks Rd and parts of Haven Road, saw some of the biggest slips in our recent rain event August '22. Rocks Road is not considered in the PC29 by NCC due to the Slump zone overlay. I do query whether the submitter has got confused with Wakefield quay v's Rocks Rd?	Reject	*Section 6*
S460.017	Richard Brudvik-Lindner	Residential Zones	Amend	Allow some combination of 3-6 story building in places where they abut hillsides (like along Milton St/Atawhai, along Tahunanui Drive, Rocks Rd & Haven Rd; in select locations along Waimea Rd/Rutherford; & along the	Refer to reasons in submission point S460.015.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS25.015	Port Nelson LTD		Oppose	Reject	PNL opposes any intensification in areas subject to the Port Effects Control Overlay as this area is already subject to potentially higher noise levels and intensification would increase the number of sensitive receptors. Disallow this submission insofar as it relates to any properties within the Port Effects Control Overlay.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS61.051	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The Particular Part of the submission I oppose/:- we should also allow some combination of 3-6 story building in places where they about hillsides (like along Milton St/Atawhai, along Tahunanui Drive, Rocks Rd & Haven Rd. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my opposition:- Parts of Tahunanui Drive, all of Rocks Rd and parts of Haven Road, saw some of the biggest slips in our recent rain event August '22. Rocks Road is not considered in the PC29 by NCC due to the Slump zone overlay. I do query whether the submitter has got confused with Wakefield quay v's Rocks Rd?	Accept	*Section 6*

FS72.055	Jude Osborne		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The Particular Part of the submission I oppose/:- we should also allow some combination of 3-6 story building in places where they about hillsides (like along Milton St/Atawhai, along Tahunanui Drive, Rocks Rd & Haven Rd. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my opposition:- Parts of Tahunanui Drive, all of Rocks Rd and parts of Haven Road, saw some of the biggest slips in our recent rain event August '22. Rocks Road is not considered in the PC29 by NCC due to the Slump zone overlay. I do query whether the submitter has got confused with Wakefield quay v's Rocks Rd?	Accept	*Section 6*
FS60.047	Tahunanui Community Hub		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The Particular Part of the submission I oppose/:- we should also allow some combination of 3-6 story building in places where they about hillsides (like along Milton St/Atawhai, along Tahunanui Drive, Rocks Rd & Haven Rd. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my opposition:- Parts of Tahunanui Drive, all of Rocks Rd and parts of Haven Road, saw some of the biggest slips in our recent rain event August '22. Rocks Road is not considered in the PC29 by NCC due to the Slump zone overlay. I do query whether the submitter has got confused with Wakefield quay v's Rocks Rd?	Accept	*Section 6*
S460.018	Richard Brudvik-Lindner	Residential Zones	Amend	Allow 3-4 Storey buildings in Victory and Nelson South.	There are also places in Victory and Nelson South which could accommodate this kind of intensification. Much of these decisions should be driven by intensification along major transportation corridors, as this would make public transportation more viable, vital and used.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S463.009	Derek Smail and Julia Burbury	Residential Zones	Oppose	Change any use under REr.18 and REr.19 to Discretionary or Non-complying [and] require notification and affected neighbour approval [inferred].	[I oppose] the proposed Rule REr.19B.3, 19F.3, 19R.4, and 19S.4 to have certain development on a site as "restricted discretionary" with no "notification" and affected persons consent not being required; and Council's discretion being restricted, with the basic premise that 6 storeys (19.5 metres of height) and recession angles, which are at an angle under which the neighbour may at certain periods of the year not see any direct sunlight, would be acceptable. [I oppose] the whole theory of "planned built character" of the HDZ as set out in the Rules in REr.19, as I interpret that as meaning the Council commences its consideration of the exercise of its "discretion" on the basis that a building 19.5 m of height and a building with 12 m walls 1 metre from the boundary is appropriate in any area zoned principally for residential activity. [I oppose] the inclusion of the words "resource consent applications for restricted discretionary activities will be considered without notification, or obtaining written approval of affected persons" in REr.19B.3, REr.19F.3, REr.19R.4, REr.19S.4 and wherever else they appear. [I oppose] any use under REr.18 and Rer.19 which is "restricted discretionary" (all should be changed to discretionary or non-complying).	Reject	*Section 6*
S478.010	Nelson Airport Limited	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend Policy RE1.7.iii Rules that encourage a built-form whichcan better promote passive surveillanceof streets and supporting a high qualitybuilt-form which minimises effects onneighbouring properties, as well asreverse sensitivity effects on nationallyand/or regionally significantinfrastructure.	Nelson Airport is aware and supportive of the need to provide greater intensified residential housing options for the Nelson region. However, Nelson Airport considers that it is essential that intensification occurs in a manner that promotes well-functioning urban environments, as well as the health and wellbeing of residents, while minimising the effects of reverse sensitivity on nationally and regionally significant infrastructure, such as Nelson Airport.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS51.010	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated		Oppose	Reject	The particular points of the submission we oppose are: All parts. The relief sought by NAL as to the requested change to Policy RE1.7 is considered to be unnecessary and inappropriate. It is considered that NAL are attempting here to impose additional control and influence (policy direction) over urban form outside of the Airport Effects Control Overlay. It is considered that NAL should be responsible for mitigating the adverse effects of its activities rather than imposing that mitigation on the receiving environment. In addition, the requested changes / relief sought should have been comprehensively addressed and justified (under section 32) as a part of PC30. As such, and given the importance of a fully integrated assessment, it is considered that PC29 and PC30 need to be heard together.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.107	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Oppose	Reject	No reason stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

S510.001	Adrian Parlane	Mapping	Oppose	[Rezone] Kaka and Kea Streets and Neale, Newall and Bledisloe Avenues, Stoke fromMedium Density Zone to General ResidentialZone.	1 The Plan would alter the fundamental character of the area we have chosen to live in a quiet, sunny, well vegetated suburban area. 2 The one size fits all approach favours developers with no account taken of existing residents' lifestyle and viewpoints. There is no right of objection. 3 The plan ignores daylight angles so potentially existing property owners could have, particularly, East and West aspect sun blocked creating frost zones on their North in winter. Hardly conducive to healthy homes. To some extent orientation on the section in relation to neighbours is of greater importance than just height. 4 The plan ignores the existing property owners' rights to privacy in their own property as prospective buildings can be 1 metre from the boundary and 3 storeys, 12 metres tall. 6 The development of medium density housing would be random around Stoke as properties become available so 3 story 12metre housing blocks would be popping up throughout suburbia. 7 Currently Stoke has a sensible building footprint to section ratio which allows most of us to maintain a viable garden producing household vegetables and fruit. Given the cost of living this is an important factor. The proposed Plan takes no account such an important activity.	Reject	*Section 6*
S510.002	Adrian Parlane	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Amend] the minimum side and rear yard setback to 1.5 metres.	Refer to reasons in submission point S510.001.	Reject	*Section 6*

S517.011	Megan Courtney	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend Policy RE1.7 as follows: *Enable medium density residential living that increases housing supply and choice on land within walking distance of the Inner City, City Fringe, public transport stops, and Suburban Commercial zones with a planned built character of residential buildings generally up to three storeys; with supporting small scale commercial activities. Rezone areas that are within in a walkable catchment of public transport stops*	Enabling medium density residential living within walking distance of public transport stops will better achieve the policy direction of the NPS Urban Development and help support the provision of public transport. This will also help provide climate change resilience, particularly in locations free of natural hazard risk. These changes will also help alleviate concerns about 6 storey development that have been raised by the community.	Reject	*Section 6*
S522.002	Annette Win	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain existing] residential daylight control rules [for the eastern and western sides of Tasman Street from Manuka Street to Bronte Street].	Medium density housing on the eastern side of Tasman Street, plus high density housing on the western side, would mean many houses on the eastern side of the street will not get sunlight from dawn to dusk. This is not acceptable in an existing low-rise residential area, this far from the CBD. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S524.002	Paul Barter	Residential Zones	Oppose	Re-evaluate the use of the term 'daylight' in the plan to ensure that it adequately considers shading effects on neighbouring properties, and increase the proposed distances to neighbouring properties.	The proposal for Medium and High Density Residential Zones, which allows for three and six-story buildings, raises serious concerns regarding the loss of sunlight to neighbouring properties.	Reject	*Section 6*
S524.007	Paul Barter	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	If intensification is to occur in residential zones, it should be limited to a maximum of two stories.	To minimize the impact on existing properties.	Reject	*Section 6*
S525.002	Jane Rogers	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Create rules] to control the height of [new] buildings to prevent shadowing to existing low-rise buildings.	My biggest concern is in regards to how existing houses will be affected especially in regard to sunlight and shadow cast on them if they are in areas designated for 3 to 6 stories.	Reject	*Section 6*
S534.004	Lynette Nicholas	Residential Zones	Amend	Limit intensification in the residential zones to amaximum of two stories.	To minimize the impact on existing properties.	Reject	*Section 6*
S544.029	Andrea Papai	Mapping	Oppose	Rezone Locking Street to lower density due to natural hazard risks [inferred].	We live on Locking Street which is a MDZ under PC 29 (MDZ on that unstable hill. You've got to be joking).	Accept	*Section 6*

S545.002	Jeremy Butler	Residential Zones	Support in part	[Oppose] using the national Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) as the basis for the bulk and location of buildings. Instead develop guidelines or a design-led process that promotes quality medium density design.	Design is an important element of medium density development. A design-led approach is necessary to guide development. The MDRS approach is suboptimal in larger cities, and should not be adopted by Nelson, even in a modified form. The MDRS is a poor standards to base medium density development on. The rule framework should make good design mandatory, but recognising that every site is different and design should respond appropriately to the constraints of the site. In other words, the rules should less reflect numerical building envelope parameters, and instead should achieve quality design outcomes through complying with guideline documents, and/or expert assessment.	Reject	*Section 6*
S560.003	Jane Bayley	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Reduce the maximum building height in REr18.J to 10m with no roof pitch averaging and anything higher being a Discretionary Activity [in the Medium Density Residential Zone].	Oppose the increase to permitted building height from 7.5m to 11m (or higher with roof pitch) Council should have a definitive level rather than a potential averaging level for roof pitch. This is a major consideration if someone used the rolling height assessment and a averaged roof assessment. Based on a 0.5 Freeboard and 2.75m between floors with a shallow roof pitch, 10m should be the maximum figure required if Council wants to pursue a 3 storey unit. Anything higher then being a Discretionary activity.	Reject	*Section 6*
S560.006	Jane Bayley	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Amend] REr.18.K and reduce the daylight recession plane to 45 degrees starting at 4m.	Sunshine hours within a property is considered in NZ to be a common right. Around NZ this has historically be achieved through using adjustable angles based on the property boundary positions. The proposal removes this and is creating a higher angle (60 degrees starting a 4m) does not take into the effects of the suns pattern . Council is failing its community by reducing daylight protection in a city which prides itself and markets itself on being the sunshine capital. Seek to replace with starting at 4m and a 45 degree angle.	Reject	*Section 6*

S560.011	Jane Bayley	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Amend REr.18B to enable up to four residential units on a site as a permitted activity within the medium density residential zone, provided one on site carpark per unit is provided [as per submission point S560.010].	Council's premise for PC29 is densification through increasing building height, however other than increasing the number of residential units to 3, has shown no planning provisions for intensification. Recommend that Medium Density (3 storey) consider density at 4 units per allotment provided one on site park per unit. Recommend that High Density (with a reduced 3 storey) consider density at 6 units per allotment provided one on site park per unit and one loading bay.	Reject	*Section 6*
S571.003	Tim Fraser-Harris	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Review and amend REr.18K to account better for sunlight, Ie. factoring in the orientation of the boundary and its implication, with particular reference to the sun's winter angles at this latitude.	I feel the proposed rule change leaves too much to chance, with a significant risk of neighbouring properties, especially to the South of a new building, being completely shaded in winter, and no say/input/recourse for the residents. It also looks like the lower angle of sunlight at this latitude has not been factored in. See attached sketch [to original submission]. The concern I am trying to illustrate is the removal of sunlight from an existing dwelling during the winter months. Yes, a three storey new building would have to be set further back from the boundary, but under the proposed plan change, you could have a two storey building up to nearly 7.5m high just 2m from your northern boundary. We recently had a new house built on our northern boundary on the Tahunanui Hills. It was done in a sensitive way, we had the option to review the plans and approve as part of the resource consent process, and the outcome is great.	Reject	*Section 6*

S573.002	David Allan	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend the rules to provide sunlight to each residential unit are strengthened to ensure at winter solstice provides direct sunlight for a minimum of 4 hours per day to ground level of the north face of the dwelling as well as the outdoor living area.	I support Medium Density zones in principle to enable intensification. High sunlight climate is a key reason many people live in Nelson. I suggest rules to provide sunlight to each residential unit are strengthened to ensure at winter solstice provide sunlight for a minimum of 4 hours per day to ground level of the north face of the dwelling as well as the outdoor living area. This will ensure liveable development and enjoyment of their home and outdoor living area is facilitated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S575.002	Andrew Marriott	Residential Zones	Oppose	The proposed Medium Density Zone only to be applied to any Residential Property after further consultation increasing yard set backs; decreasing maximum building height or	Refer to reasons in submission point S575.001.	Reject	*Section 6*

S580.014	Small Time Developments	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose 35m2 minimum residential unit size restriction in the Medium Density Residential zone [REr.18U].	We believe there are rules that are inconsistent with the provision of collective housing. The Draft MRZ and HRZ rules require a higher minimum floor areas for 1 bed units than is required to achieve compliance with the Housing Improvement Regulations 1947 (15 Nov 2021 version). In addition, there are examples of high-quality architect designed medium and high density apartments that are smaller that 35m2 such as the Nightingale projects in Melbourne. As most developments will be subject to Resource Consent requirements because of the more that 3 dwelling trigger, minimum house size should not be an additional trigger or assessment criteria as the Building Act and Housing Regulations previously cited adequately deal with this matter. The current drafting of the new plan rules could facilitate a situation where the average density in the GRZ increases at a faster rate and remains higher than the average density of the MRZ and HRZ for decades, thereby undermining the intention of increasing housing density close to the CBD and associated services. Conversely, facilitating transportable units into MRZ and HRZ sites until a full apartment redevelopment is feasible would encourage housing more people in the inner-city environment from the early days of the new rules being Operative. This would support the objectives of reducing transport emissions, and efficient use of community facilities, infrastructure and businesses. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S585.002	Rosemary Cooke	Mapping	Oppose	[Restrict] medium density housing to a maximum of 4 storeys only within the CBD bordered by Collingwood St, Selwyn Place, Rutherford St. and Halifax St.	I support medium density housing to a maximum of 4 storeys only within the CBD bordered by Collingwood St, Selwyn Place, Rutherford St. and Halifax St.	Reject	*Section 6*

S587.007	Change PC 29 Incorporated	Residential Zones	Oppose	Amend the Medium Density Residential Zone to ensure that any non-compliance with Rules REr.18J (as to height), and/or REr.18K (as to daylight admission) be considered as "non-complying" - and not as Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary activity, if the	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S589.033	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Residential Zones	Neutral	Further clarification needed as to the application of rule REr.18B.1 and REr.18B.3 and the relevance of assessment criteria to each activity status.	Fire and Emergency support REr.18B providing the assessment criteria listed in REr.18B.4 is applicable to all activity types under this rule. If the assessment criteria is not applied to all activity types under REr.18B, there is a risk that when developing up to three residential units on a site, emergency service access and firefighting water supply matters will not be appropriately provided for.	Reject	*Section 6*
S589.034	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Further clarification needed as to the application of these assessment criteria in REr.18B.4 to each activity type under rule REr.18B.	Fire and Emergency strongly support the inclusion of the following matters within the assessment criteria: • whether the development can be adequately serviced for firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of Practice. • whether access for emergency service vehicles is appropriately designed so that staff can access the site safely and efficiently However, it is unclear when the assessment criteria is applied and clarification regarding this is required.	Reject	*Section 6*
S597.003	Stephanie Phillips	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Remove Medium Density Residential Zone.	Refer to reasons in submission point S597.002 and the original submission for more detail.	Reject	*Section 6*
S597.006	Stephanie Phillips	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Oppose the maximum building height in the Medium Density Residential Zone [inferred].	Refer to reasons in submission point S597.005 and the original submission for more detail.	Reject	*Section 6*

S601.009	Julie Strange	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Amend] area from Motueka st to york and boundary road to be 2 storeys with [resource consent] required for each [development].	This area is a thoroughfare for Traffic coming off at Boundary road from Waimea rd. I live on Kawai st south there is traffic coming down here frequently and also tipahi st. The barriers and planter boxes need to be adjust and removed as they are congesting the streets. Parking is poor people park on both sides of the street creating a small avenue for cars to go through. My drive way is often over parked by people using and working at the Kindy. This area under your plan is a 3 storied zone, I suppose it is useful for council to have it so to then easily create 3 storied houses for housing NZ in York st area. not all the street is suitable for this type of development. The york stream runs through here and drains drain to it. The storm water does not hold in this area I see it bursting out in heavy rain. A 3 storied residence built next to mine would definitely delete my sun all day. The upper end of kawai st south towards York is developing quite quickly with 3 and 4 units been rebuilt in each property. The traffic in this atrea increasing every year. I've lived there 7 years. No one in Nelson residential areas should have to live in a 3 storied house. Keep this type of planning for closer to the city.	Reject	*Section 6*

S602.002	Andrew Ng	Residential Zones	Amend	Reduce the maximum building height in the residential zones to a maximum of two storeys [inferred].	Plan Change 29 might lead to random tall buildings in the middle of unchanged areas, making the city look messy. Plan29 allows for really tall buildings, which could block sunlight for nearby homes and lower their value. This would also mean less privacy for people. Bad designs in other parts of the country have cause problems before... With more people in Nelson, we need more homes. In the city center, where there are already big buildings, we can have 4-6 story buildings. But in places where people live, we should not change things so drastically. We can have two-story apartments or split big lands to fit with the community.	Reject	*Section 6*
S603.007	SPArchitect Ltd	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Oppose the maximum building height in the Medium Density Residential Zone [inferred].	Refer to reasons in submission point S597.005 and the original submission for more detail.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.003	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	Insert New Policy / method to apply SVS Medium Density or High-Density Zoning, [as follows]:The values of Character Area shall be maintained and enhanced, having regard: i. the original pattern of development within the Character Area, including the relationship of buildings to their site, to neighbouring sites, and to the street;ii. to the contribution existing buildings and fences make, to the Character Areas as a whole; andiii. the extent to which additions and alterations to existing buildings, or the construction of new buildings or fences, are consistent with the built	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS64.003	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety. The decision I seek is that the submission is accepted but that the specific area defined in that submission at Submission Table A (the Character Area) is extended to that area on both sides of Collingwood Street between Bronte Street and Manuka Street currently zoned low density residential (the Collingwood Street Area). The reason for my support is that I agree the area has special characteristics that have not been considered sufficiently as a part of the plan change; and the reason I seek extension of the Character Area to the Collingwood Street Area is it is contiguous with the Character Area in submission 605 and it too has special characteristics that warrant protection. Further I note that would be consistent with the treatment of neighbourhood N20-Fairfield Park in regard to Collingwood Street from Manuka Street north - as has been used by Nelson City Council in its availability and proposed neighbourhood panning.	Reject	*Section 6*

S605.025	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend] DO 15.1.1.ii Medium density Zone [as follows]: The primary goal of the Medium Density Residential Zone is to provide the opportunity for medium density housing, in walking distance to commercial services and community facilities. The zone enables a range of housing types, with a focus on more intensive forms of housing, including terraces and low rise apartments. The zone achieves a medium density residential character by generally limiting the scale and form of buildings to three storeys and requiring on site landscaped areas and private open space. Medium density residential development is more intensive than typical low density areas and will result in a moderate degree of visual change to neighbourhoods. The degree of visual change, particularly within Character Area, will be managed through resource consent process. Subject to assessment through the	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS64.026	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety. The decision I seek is that the submission is accepted but that the specific area defined in that submission at Submission Table A (the Character Area) is extended to that area on both sides of Collingwood Street between Bronte Street and Manuka Street currently zoned low density residential (the Collingwood Street Area). The reason for my support is that I agree the area has special characteristics that have not been considered sufficiently as a part of the plan change; and the reason I seek extension of the Character Area to the Collingwood Street Area is it is contiguous with the Character Area in submission 605 and it too has special characteristics that warrant protection. Further I note that would be consistent with the treatment of neighbourhood N20-Fairfield Park in regard to Collingwood Street from Manuka Street north - as has been used by Nelson City Council in its availability and proposed neighbourhood panning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.034	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend] RE1.7 Medium Density Residential Zone [as follows]: Enable medium density residential living that increases housing supply and choice on land within walking distance of the Inner City, City Fringe and Suburban Commercial zones with a planned built character of residential buildings generally up to three storeys; with supporting small scale commercial activities. Medium density development shall recognise and	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS64.035	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*

S605.035	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend] RE1A.1 [as follows]: This zone enables a range of housing types, with a focus on more intensive forms of housing, including terraces and low rise apartments. The zone achieves a medium density residential character by generally limiting the scale and form of buildings to three storeys and requiring on site landscaped areas and private open space. Medium density residential development is more intensive than typical density areas and will result in a moderate degree of visual change to neighbourhoods. The degree of visual change, particularly within	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS64.036	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.036	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Insert] new RE1.7.iv [as follows]:Overlays (such as Character Area) identify rules that require additional consideration of the surrounding environment. This ensures high quality living	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS64.037	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.047	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Mapping	Oppose	[Rezone] all [notified PC29] Medium Density [areas to] General Residential.	This submission opposes REr18A-18U in their entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS64.048	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*

S605.048	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Insert] new rule: Character Area Overlay within Medium Density or High-Density Residential ZonesPermitted:In a Character Area Overlay residential activity will be a permitted activity provided the following rules are complied:i. REr17D (Front yard)ii. REr17E (Other yards)iii. REr.17I (Fences)iv. Rer.17J (Maximum Building Height)v. REr.17K (Daylight Admission)vi. REr.17L (Outlook and Privacy)Controlled:Not applicableDiscretionary/NC/Prohibited:Development that exceeds these standards within a Character Area Overlay will be a discretionary activity.Assessment criteria:a. any special or unusual characteristics of the site or the proposal that are relevant to the infringement.b. whether the proposal would mitigate any adverse amenity effects on-site, to neighbouring sites and/or the street or public open space, through the use of building breaks, height variations, landscaping and architectural features.i. the site is of a sufficient size that infringing height elements can be placed centrally within a site away from neighbouring properties and/or partially screened	The [decision requested in this submission point] forms an example of alternative relief that ensures development within Medium Density and High-Density zones that is in exceedance of General Residential standards will be comprehensively assessed as a discretionary activity.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS64.049	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*
S608.007	Nelsust Inc. - Peter Olorenshaw	Residential Zones	Amend	Reduce maximum permitted building height to 2 stories (8m) as of right in the Medium Density Residential Zone	Refer to reasons in submission point S608.006.	Reject	*Section 6*

S608.019	Nelsust Inc. - Peter Olorenshaw	Residential Zones	Amend	Change the recession planes in the Medium Density Residential Zones to allow higher recession planes [5m and 45 degrees] on southern oriented boundaries where the neighbouring property has built a party wall on	Refer to reasons in submission point S608.09 and the original submission for more detail.	Reject	*Section 6*
S610.005	Sarah Little	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Remove] the MediumResidential Zone inDodson Valley asproposed. It shouldbe only generalresidential instead,or unchanged fromcurrent plan.	There are already concerns around ability to transport people and vehicles along Dodson Valley Road due to its narrow portions. This would only worsen. It would also decrease the visual amenity, light, and privacy of all residents within the valley due to the topography. The valley did not fare well during the most recent weather events, and adding to intensification would only make that worse due to location of streams, fault lines and the land being on a giant gully.	Accept	*Section 6*
S614.006	Redbox Architects 2017 Ltd	Residential Zones	Amend	Require controls over visual privacy in the medium density residential zone.	Given reduced setbacks and increased height proposed in the medium and high density areas we believe some controls over visual privacy should be required. Outlook is required under the proposed rules but not visual privacy.	Accept	*Section 6*
S616.005	Loretta Hogg	Mapping	Oppose	Delete the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Refer to reasons in submission point S616.003.	Reject	*Section 6*
S621.003	Paula Holden	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Reduce the maximum building heights [in the Residential Medium Density Zone].	Allowing buildings to be 4 storeys as of right is too high due to effecting the sunlight and privacy of nearby residents.	Reject	*Section 6*
S625.011	Resilienz Ltd Lindsay Wood	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend the maximum permitted building height in the Medium Density Residential Zone to 11.5m for timber lower floor; and 10.9m for concrete ground floor construction	Refer to reasons in submission points S625.009 and S625.010.	Reject	*Section 6*
S626.010	Raine Estate Oaklands Ltd	Residential Zones	Amend	Review and amend the maximum building length rules [REr.18S and REr.19S] to ensure they are individually workable, practical, effective and allow for good outcomes to be	Refer to reasons in submission point S626.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
S629.005	Samuel Nevin	Residential Zones	Neutral	Suggest that minimum sizes be added for 2, 3 and 4 bedrooms too. Currently only for 1 bedroom/studio units (e.g, 19U).	Minimum unit sizes for all units with a greater number of bedrooms will maintain minimum quality standards for habitable units.	Reject	*Section 6*
S647.002	Christopher Fitchett	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Request] that the maximum height in the MRZ be reduced from 12 metres, (three storeys), to 8 metres, (two storeys).	I would not be happy if my neighbour put a 12 metre building blocking my view and sunlight. I support the Council's plan to allow three units on any one property but suggest that a maximum height should be 8 metres (2 storeys).	Reject	*Section 6*

S677.015	Justin Allen	Mapping	Oppose	[Amend the plan so] any medium and high density zones and buildings over two storeys [are] in the CBD	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S694.004	Glenys MacLellan	Residential Zones	Amend	Ensure medium density development provides communal spaces for neighbours.	I live in what is medium-density housing in Nelson, 12 x 2 bedroom units of approx. 60m? plus driveway and carports on 2900 sqm. This has created what I call a little village with 24 people and an age range of 2 to 81 currently. These are the types of community higher-density housing that need to be thought of when designing the complexes. It's not just about the structures, people need to enjoy living there and a wide demographic has more of a community-building opportunity. Design for the ability of Neighbours to meet and mingle is essential.	Reject	*Section 6*
S707.001	June Laird	Residential Zones	Oppose	Delay the changes related to medium density zoning to allow for further policy development and consideration of options in relation to access to [day]light [and] further consultation.	I do have concerns about the intensification outside of the CBD in zones proposed to be 'medium intensity'. This mostly relates to the effect that building three storey properties of up to 12 metres would have on the light accessible by (and following value of) neighbouring properties. I acknowledge the restrictions in medium density zones that properties can only cover up to 50% of the site and that the maximum allowable building height decreases as the building gets closer to the side and rear boundaries of the site in order to leave space for daylight to get to neighbouring properties (in medium density zones being 4m + 60 degree angle). However, with buildings up to 12m, I think that this will still limit the sunlight available to properties in a way that is detrimental to both enjoyment and value of the neighbouring properties. I would also note here the significant mental health benefits from access to sunlight and the potential for this policy change to negatively impact people's mental health in this way.	Reject	*Section 6*
S708.049	Harry Pearson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to ensure that any non-compliance with Rules REr.18J (as to height) and/or REr.18K (as to daylight admissions) be considered as "non-complying" - and not as	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

S708.051	Harry Pearson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to ensure that failure to comply strictly with all other Rules in Rules REr.18 set out in PC29 will make the proposal "non-complying"	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S709.061	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend District wide explanation DO16.1.1.iii [and associated Residential Zone explanation RE1.7.i] as follows: The primary goal of the Medium Density Residential Zone is to provide the opportunity for medium density housing, in walking distance to commercial services and community facilities. The zone enables a range of housing types, with a focus on more intensive forms of housing, including terraces and accessible low rise apartments. The zone achieves a medium density residential character by generally limiting the scale and form of buildings to three storeys and requiring usable and accessible on site landscaped areas and private open space. Medium density residential development is more intensive than typical low density areas and will result in a moderate degree of visual change to	Refer to reasons in submission point S709.060 and the original submission.	Reject	*Section 6*
S709.083	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Approve REr.18U Residential unit Minimum size, with amendments to the assessment criteria as follows: REr.18U.4.b. whether each unit has access to communal facilities (e.g. shared laundry, vegetable garden) and /or storage facilities within the building.c. whether each residential unit is usable and accessible for disabled people.	Support in full REr.18U Residential unit Minimum size. Allowing smaller residential units supports a diverse housing typology. This is important as the number of older adults, who may require single unit dwellings, increases. Smaller dwellings can also provide a more affordable housing option for people. Additional wording suggested to strengthen the assessment criteria to consider the needs of disabled people. [Refer to the original detail for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS56.106	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora consider these requirements are too restrictive and do not provide for an appropriate level of housing choice.	Accept	*Section 6*

FS38.023	Small Time Developments		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support are: Approve REr.18U Residential unit Minimum size, with amendments to the assessment criteria as follows: REr.18U.4.b. whether each unit has access to communal facilities (e.g. shared laundry, vegetable garden) and /or storage facilities within the building.c. whether each residential unit is usable and accessible for disabled people. Agree with the recognition of communal facilities, but we believe that affordable and effective units can be provided with a smaller minimum size.	Reject	*Section 6*
S718.001	Murray and Rosette Webber	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Permit no greater than] single storey buildings on this area of the street because of the buildings behind it.	I oppose the change to the area of 120 and 122 Tipahi Street, this area borders onto our property on the east side. My concerns are as listed: This will create shade in the morning with multi stories. Loss of view. Extra noise from large increase in people. Increase in crime. More cars parked in the area. Sleep effected from parties, fighting, cars... Devaluation of property. Area is already under threat with Southern Link proposal [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S732.008	John Fitchett	Residential Zones	Oppose	Set the maximum building height limit at 11 meters [Any contravention of this permitted standard is] to be considered as a non-complying activity.	I oppose all and any maximum height (in any Residential Zone) in excess of 11 metres. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.167	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	A great submission and agree with majority of points in their submission and the example at the end is the reason why this plan change is so wrong.	Reject	*Section 6*
S754.048	Jan Jordan	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to ensure that any non-compliance with Rules REr.18J (as to height) and/or REr.18K (as to daylight admissions) be considered as "non-complying" - and not as	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S754.050	Jan Jordan	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to ensure that failure to comply strictly with all other Rules in Rules REr.18 set out in PC29 will make the proposal "non-complying"	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

S773.002	Duncan Murray and Bridget Helen Unsworth	Residential Zones	Support	Approve the MDZ for the site at 27 Brougham Street, Nelson.	More specifically, the Submitter supports the proposed Medium Density Residential zoning at 27 Brougham Street, Nelson as it will deliver a well-functioning urban environment, and does not support any change to the zoning other than to achieve greater intensification than is currently proposed by the MDRS. The Site meets the Council's own requirements for up-zoning land under PC29: a) The is not at risk of coastal inundation from future potential sea level rise, being located well inland. b) The site is not affected by either coastal or river flood hazards. c) The site was not significantly affected by the August 2022 flood event. d) The site is not located in an area that is defined as Slope Instability Area 1. The Site is not proposed to be located within any of the new overlays, and this exclusion is supported by the Submitter, including the: - Liquefaction Hazard Overlay area - Fault Deformation Overlay - Fault Awareness Overlay - Four new slope instability overlays - Three new flood hazard overlays. The Submitter therefore considers the Site is suitable to accommodate the Medium Density Residential Standards ("MDRS") as required of Tier 1 Councils by the Resource Management Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters Amendment Act (2021), and that the proposed zone and pattern of surrounding zoning, will deliver a well-functioning urban environment.	Accept	*Section 6*

FS78.335	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Approve the MDZ for the site at 27 Brougham Street, Nelson. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new comprehensive independent study of the effects of this proposal on the character and heritage buildings of Nelson that informs changes to proposed rules and policies (on and off-site height, boundary set back, daylight angles). The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS65.381	Heritage Nelson		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission we oppose is: Approve the MDZ for the site at 27 Brougham Street, Nelson. Reasons include (please also refer to our original submission #831 as in many cases multiple reasons have been noted): In some cases, information is incorrect. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new study on effects of proposals on heritage and character of City. The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice. It has been undertaken by one person rather than a multidisciplinary team.	Reject	*Section 6*
S860.006	Noah Hosie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to ensure that any non-compliance with Rules REr.18J (as to height) and/or REr.18K (as to daylight admissions) be considered as "non-complying" - and not as	I oppose the inclusion of "restricted discretionary" in the PC29 in relation to any residential zone.	Reject	*Section 6*
S860.007	Noah Hosie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to ensure that failure to comply strictly with all other Rules in Rules REr.18 set out in PC29 will make the proposal "non-complying"	I oppose the inclusion of "restricted discretionary" in the PC29 in relation to any residential zone.	Reject	*Section 6*
S879.006	Tasman District Council	Residential Zones	Amend	Clarify the Explanation with respect to the Rule [REr.18D].	Clause REr.18D.5 (Explanation) states that "... recognizing that the rules do enable buildings to adjoin the boundary for part of the site." This Explanation cross references to the Other Yards in Rule REr.18E which doesn't appear to allow for any buildings to be located within the 1m side and rear boundary yards. This appears to be an inconsistency between the Explanation and the Rule and should be clarified.	Reject	*Section 6*

S888.006	Chris Allison	Residential Zones	Amend	Request reductions to max height. As stated in the Nelsust submission (S608): Reduce maximum permitted building height to 2 stories (8m) as of right in the Medium Density	Refer to reasons in submission point S888.005.	Reject	*Section 6*
S890.003	Annette Milligan and Christopher Skinner	Residential Zones	Amend	Limit the height of building in residential areas to no more than 3 storeys. Commit to maintain the quality of life currently enjoyed by residents [through retaining current daylight angles from	We support up to 3 storeys of building in the rest of Nelson so long as current sun angles of existing homes is not impeded.	Reject	*Section 6*
S894.012	The New Zealand Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	Residential Zones	Support	Support the proposed residential zone policy RE1.7 Medium Density Residential Zone: Enable medium density residential living that increases housing supply and choice on land within walking distance of the Inner City, City Fringe and Suburban Commercial zones with a planned built character of residential buildings generally up to three storeys; with supporting small scale commercial activities.	Waka Kotahi also has a role in giving effect to the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS). The GPS is required under the LTMA and outlines the Government's strategy to guide land transport investment over the next 10 years. The four strategic priorities of the GPS 2021 are safety, better travel options, climate change and improving freight connections. A key theme of the GPS is integrating land use, transport planning and delivery. Land use planning has a significant impact on transport policy, infrastructure and services provision, and vice versa. Once development has happened, it has a longterm impact on transport. Changes in land use can affect the demand for travel, creating both pressures and opportunities for investment in transport infrastructure and services, or for demand management. For these reasons, Waka Kotahi seeks full utilisation of the tools available to Council to enable development in the most accessible urban areas.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S933.055	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amendments sought [to REr.18B.1]: Development of up to three residential units on a site is a permitted activity, ~~provided that the development complies with all the permitted conditions in this Rule Table.~~	Kainga Ora supports the permitted rule (REr.18B1) enabling up to 3 units. However, amendment is sought as compliance is concurrently tied to complying with all conditions in the "rule table". This proviso is unnecessary as compliance with each condition is separately managed through other rules.	Accept	*Section 6*

FS73.143	EQC Toka Tū Ake		Oppose	Reject	The submitter (Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities) requests removing the Rule Table which provides context for what development complies with the permitted, controlled, discretionary and restricted conditions. We disagree with the removal of reference to the Rule Table in the suggested amendments to REr17B.1 because it helps provides a clear approach to which rules apply.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.056	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain remaining rule framework at REr.18B.3.	Kainga Ora supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status (REr.18B.3) where 4 or more units are proposed, subject to meeting accessibility conditions. Kainga Ora supports the notification preclusion that applies to REr.18B.3.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S933.057	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Delete REr.18B.3 a) and b).	Kainga Ora does not support the requirement to include 10% wheelchair accessible units where 10+ units are provided for within REr.18B.3. Kainga Ora consider this requirement as too restrictive if not a desired option for that specific development and adds additional cost and reduction in space. Kainga Ora consider that this design aspect is best left as a choice for a developer and the market that is being targeted.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.059	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain rule [REr.18D] framework as notified, but include notification preclusions.	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.18D Front Yards] framework; but seeks amendment to include notification preclusions (both public and limited notification} where compliance is not achieved.	Accept	*Section 6*
S933.060	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support	Retain rule [REr.18E] framework as notified.	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.18E Other Yards] framework in its entirety.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S933.061	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend rule [REr.18F] to delete clause d) and e).	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.18F Outdoor Living Court] framework, including the notification preclusion statement, however, does not support clause d) or e) as this is considered too restrictive.	Reject	*Section 6*

S933.062	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support	Retain rule [REr.18G] framework as notified, but include notification preclusions.	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.18G Corner Sites] framework; but seeks amendment to include notification preclusions (both public and limited notification) where compliance is not achieved, as infringement to this standard would be assessed by relevant traffic experts and notification would not benefit the consent process.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S933.063	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain rule [REr.18H] framework as notified, but include notification preclusions.	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.18H Permeable landscaped area] framework; but seeks amendment to include notification preclusions (both public and limited notification) where compliance is not achieved.	Accept	*Section 6*
S933.064	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support	Retain rule [REr.18I] framework as notified.	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.18I Fences] framework in its entirety.	Accept	*Section 6*
S933.065	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support	Retain rule [REr.18J] framework as notified.	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.18J Maximum Building Height] framework in its entirety.	Accept	*Section 6*
S933.066	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support	Retain rule [REr.18K] framework as notified.	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.18K Daylight admission] framework in its entirety.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S933.067	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain rule framework as notified, but include notification preclusions Amendments [to REr.17L.3] sought as follows: Activities that contravene a permitted condition are restricted discretionary. Discretion is restricted to: iii. effects on the quality of on- site living environments; and~~privacy effects on neighbouring sites.~~	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.18L Outlook and privacy] framework; but seeks amendment to include notification preclusions (both public and limited notification) where compliance is not achieved. Kainga Ora also seeks amendment from the matters of discretion, to remove privacy effects on neighbouring sites. This Standard is an onsite amenity control, with other standards managing offsite amenity outcomes (e.g. setbacks, height, height in relation to boundary controls).	Reject	*Section 6*

S933.068	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain rule [REr.18M] framework as notified, but include notification preclusions.	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.18M Glazing to the street] framework; but seeks amendment to include notification preclusions (both public and limited notification) where compliance is not achieved. This rule seeks to manage the interface with the street (positive design and passive surveillance) and notification would not benefit the consent process.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S933.070	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain rule [REr.18S] framework as notified, but include notification preclusions.	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.18S Building Length] framework; but seeks amendment to include notification preclusions (both public and limited notification) where compliance is not achieved.	Accept	*Section 6*
S934.007	Nicholas Priest	Residential Zones	Amend	Require new development to be consistent with the character and height of adjacent existing dwellings [inferred].	Is it strictly necessary to say development can take place in exiting well established leafy street of Nelson? Up to 3 stories. It is not necessary I would strongly suggest. 3 story is high when set against most of Nelsons older housing stock being 1 story or two story. With the odd exception being higher (Warwick house) see reference image 3 in the original submission. When building in the 3-story zone can it be made mandatory to address the surrounding acritude, for example if a development has colonial style bungalows either side, should the new development be encouraged to respect the adjoining properties?	Reject	*Section 6*
S940.002	Mitchell Hutchings	Residential Zones	Amend	Develop a regimented consenting process for high density developments that can be applied for in the medium density zone (not making it the permitted level) and allow for consideration for relevant criteria including: visual amenity (developing on street corners only; increasing yard setbacks to a minimum of three metres; allowing development only where it borders a	Refer to reasons in submission point S940.001.	Accept	*Section 6*

S16.001	Zoe Hague	Residential Zones	Oppose	Delete the provision for six stories in residential areas.	I'm against the 6 stories in residential areas. You propose it in example Washington Valley which already gets minimal sunlight and is damp. Building a 6 story building next to a house means they will have no sunlight. 6 stories is way too high in residential areas.	Reject	*Section 6*
S20.007	Tim Bayley	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Oppose] building 6 story apartments in existing residential neighbourhoods.	There is no place for building 6 story apartments in existing residential neighbourhoods. There is just no point to doing this. As a commercial venture these building are an incredibly risky financial project. The cost of building now is such that units in these building need to sell for well over a million dollars and most 2 bedroom or bigger selling for well north of $1.5 million. Is there a demand? I suggest not, as shown by the lack of units that where build under National's Special Housing Areas back in the teens. There were several high rise apartments proposed under this "Fast Track" scheme around the Port Hills (where interestingly they would not have effected anyone's sunlight) but now some 8 years later only one of these is "under construction" behind Spotlight at the end of Halifax St and even it has had it's issues with being in "suspension" for the past 7 month as there was not enough money or sales to continue (sic) [Note these statistics relating to built Special Housing Areas are incorrect]. Refer to the original submission section 6 for more detail.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.007	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	*Section 6*

S20.019	Tim Bayley	Mapping	Amend	Allow six story high rise apartments from the end of Halifax St behind Spotlight [71 Haven Road] to the existing 3 apartments on Wakefield Quay [283 Wakefield Quay] with gaps for the existing residential areas.	I think that six story high rise apartments should only be allowed in areas where it has minimal effect on existing residential neighbourhoods. The best location for this is from the end of Halifax St behind Spotlight right around to the existing 3 apartments on Wakefield Quay. This is the best position for these building with the "backs" to the hill and the fronts to the north and overlooking the port. These could extend all the way round Haven Road with only a couple of gaps for existing residential areas. Auckland Point School could be redeveloped as a new modern school wit 5 or 6 stories of social housing above "stacked"up the hill.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.019	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	*Section 6*

S24.001	Richard Russell	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Seek 3 stories for buildings in the High Density [Zone] to be the maximun permitted height limit as of right.	I am not against progress or infill development as such but I consider the proposal to allow the intensification of the Medium and High Density areas as shown in the plan with a maximum building height equivalent to almost the height NCC's own headquarters in Trafalgar St and the Rutherford Hotel without resource consent processes applying and with people not being able to have their say, runs a serious risk of seriously damaging and endangering community and amenity values which are so important for the residents in Nelson. To allow buildings of up to 6 stories in the areas proposed without proper consultation and consideration of the impact on immediate neighbours and the surrounding community without the people affected being able to be heard and have their say, is divisive and plainly wrong. The principles of natural justice and people having the right to be heard about matters affecting them and their community seems to be ignored in the Plan Change proposed. I would urge Council to give these aspects of Plan Change 29 much closer scrutiny than would have appear have occurred so far. For these reasons I oppose Plan Change 29 in its current form.	Reject	*Section 6*
S24.002	Richard Russell	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Seek 2 stories for buildings in the High Density [Zone] to be the maximun permitted height limit as of right.	Refer to reasons in submission point S24.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S37.001	Graeme Anderson	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Change the plan to reduce the 6-storey limit to 4 and include rules preventing developments from adversely impacting on neighbouring properties.	While I support the need for some housing intensification I think there should still be rules which would prevent new developments from adversely impacting the amenity of neighbouring properties (views, light, parking etc) and that neighbours should be informed of new developments and be permitted to object if they wish to.	Reject	*Section 6*

S59.002	Colin Bell	Residential Zones	Amend	[Reduce] the maximum number of storeys from 6 to 3.	The plan allows for multi-storey buildings in close proximity. Potential problems with such developments include: - loss of daylight, views and privacy for people living in their shadow - loss of adjacent green space - increases in residential noise and in traffic - wind tunnel effects. Such problems would reduce the quality of life for those affected. Keeping the current daylight angles would reduce most of these effects by ensuring adequate separation between multi-storey buildings. It would also allow space for emergency access, off road parking and adjacent green areas for children's playgrounds and amenity planting. Allotments may be appropriate in some situations as will the siting NCC infrastructure in others. This could include connecting lanes to encourage foot and cycle traffic. These safeguards will help ensure high quality residential blocks are developed. They should not only provide for the needs of those living there but also enhance the surrounding area so that all benefit from the development. Reserve levies paid by developers to NCC can be used to help purchase the extra land needed.	Reject	*Section 6*
S59.003	Colin Bell	Residential Zones	Amend	[Retain] existing daylight angles.	Refer to reasons in submission point S59.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
S60.003	Dan McGuire	Residential Zones	Support	[Include] Wainui House [155 Nile Street] in the high density [zone].	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

S61.001	Jennifer Black	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict any high density (dwellings 3 stories and higher) to the mixed use and city centre City zones already set out in the draft Nelson Plan and leave those areas designated high density under PC29 as they currently are.	1. I believe that this process of consultation and submissions has a very short time frame, has not been well explained, and I have received nothing to help explain the changes being suggested. 2. High density residential builds are not required in Nelson to house the present or future population, as has been stated - we have sufficient in plan for our population until 2035. 3. Nelson is purported to be the best little city in Nelson - I suggest this is due to our neighbourhood residential environments - plenty of space and sunshine where families can live and play. 4. NCC encouraged us to put in solar panels (they need sun), take out fires and therefore use electricity for warmth, especially in damp and cold older houses and New Zealanders use sunshine to dry their clothes - the alternative is again electricity driven. These three issues will not be available if high density housing is allowed, next door. Everyone has the right to a dry, warm home that they can afford to maintain. Adding further increased electricity costs will be a cost that many will not be able to sustain. AND the solar panels will be a wasted investment. 5. Why should developers be allowed to build these buildings without considering the rights if their neighbours who will under the proposal have no ability to oppose such developments.	Reject	*Section 6*

S66.001	Thomas Trainer	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Limit the height of building to two stories.	A multi story development sited on the section in front of our section would completely spoil the enjoyment we get from our garden and our privacy. Sunlight angles onto our property should be catered for to ensure a viable existing vegetable garden can continue to produce food. The intrinsic value of our property would undoubtedly be significantly diminished as would the immense pleasure we enjoy living in this quite special home.	Reject	*Section 6*
S67.001	Leonora Voigtlander	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Opposed to plan change 29! It is not a good idea for Nelson to start building 6 story buildings. Sunlight is already a problem for most houses. Preserve Nelson and the	[Reduce the maximum number of stories to] three.	Reject	*Section 6*
S72.002	Charles Rands	Residential Zones	Oppose	Decrease the high density daylight recession angle to 45 degrees.	The current proposed recession angle of 60 degrees will create very shady residential areas that will affect neighbours to the developments and those living and working in the area in general.	Reject	*Section 6*
S75.007	Eliot Sinclair and Partners Ltd	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Delete REr.19K(a)(ii) and delete the reference to 23.5m in REr.19K(a)(i).	There are two different meters provided for daylight admission that you can measure from. The recession plane measuring point should be kept to one meterage on all boundaries rather than two different measurements. The proposed rule bulks the building along the road frontage rather than to the rear. On sites deeper than 23.5m wanting to develop the full site, it becomes difficult to calculate the daylight admission using two different standards producing a building form that would have an interesting interface within the site. Instead REr.18s provides for the restriction as a maximum building length permitted is 22m.	Accept	*Section 6*
S78.004	Jaimie Barber	Residential Zones	Support in part	[Propose the] requirement for design/aesthetic standards/covenants but with cost and producitvity in mind.	I only support well designed intensification. As such, there should be design standards/covenants for High Density developments but with cost and productivity in mind. The standards need to be very clear, certain and not onerous, otherwise, no one will want to take on the risk (costs) of getting rejected.	Reject	*Section 6*

S85.001	Alison Oertly	Residential Zones	Oppose	Buildings within the inner city suburbs be limited to a maximum of three storeys, with very careful consideration being given to the surrounding character of the area.	I agree that Nelson needs to consider how to adapt to the increasing population over the next decades. It is clear that we can no longer continue to build out, taking ever increasing areas of arable land to make way for subdivisions. With regards to the inner city suburbs, however, I strongly oppose the plan change which would rezone inner city suburbs currently designated 'Residential - Lower Density" to "High Density Residential Zone," allowing for development up to 19.5m (6 storeys) without a council resource consent requirement, and without any neighbour notification required. The plan changes the current building recession plane requirements and also reduces boundary setback restrictions. These proposed changes will allow for new development to dominate existing housing, impacting quality of life through reduction of privacy, sunlight loss (especially important during winter) and creating parking issues in some already congested streets, since off-street parking spaces are not required on the newly developed properties. In the case of the inner city suburbs, which have over a long time created architecturally cohesive communities, the addition of possibly 6-storey apartment blocks would completely detract from the existing cohesion. In the case of lower Shelbourne Street, for example, some of the existing 1-2 storey houses are only meters from one another, already limiting light and sunshine access. A 4-6 storey building would completely exclude these residents from sunlight and privacy.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.026	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Accept	*Section 6*
S85.004	Alison Oertly	Residential Zones	Oppose	Multi-storeyed buildings beyond the inner city suburbs should be built together as an integrated concept in an area large enough to accommodate several high rise buildings. These would ideally include a shared green space/play area/ central shared courtyard to	Refer to reasons in submission point S85.001.	Accept	*Section 6*

FS83.029	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Accept	*Section 6*
S91.001	Caroline Astridge	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Oppose] high rise buildings behind the Cathedral.	1. This area is populated by large, heritage homes which are irreplaceable due to modern day costs of building and construction. 2. These houses should be protected at all costs in order to retain long term the aesthetic appeal of the area. 3. High rise does not belong in the suburbs. It belongs in industrial areas where neighbours are unaffected, or along major transport routes with good access to public transport. Please consider the impact to existing residents of modern high rise boxes which can go up without consent from any regulatory body.	Reject	*Section 6*
S91.002	Caroline Astridge	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Reconsider the level of 6 stories for new developments.	1. Six stories is very high, and if implemented in isolation from other buildings of a similar size, sticks out on its own like the proverbial. 2. Six stories will cause a huge detrimental overshadowing impact upon immediate neighbours. 3. People will feel very threatened by the threat of such a large development next door. 4. If these developments are aimed at an aging demographic, is it appropriate to build 6 stories if lifts break down? Is high rise really suitable for the elderly? I suggest townhouses are more suitable. 5. If providing for first home buyers, is it appropriate to destroy the aesthetics of the town to provide for this market? There are plenty of other places for first home buyers, and we don't need to destroy our town for them to find them.	Accept	*Section 6*

S92.004	Paul Nicholson	Residential Zones	Amend	Limit apartment buildings in the High Density Residential Zone to four (4) stories and 15m in height.	In a residential area, any building that is greater than 15m in height would be out of scale and have an adverse affect on the quality of adjoining residences. In addition, research shows that as apartment building increase in height, there is a proportionate increase in depression, isolation, crime, anti-social behaviour and sleep problems, along with a loss in "community."	Reject	*Section 6*
S92.006	Paul Nicholson	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Review the areas included in the High Density Residential Zone with a focus on removing those where there is existing residential housing; transfer the following areas to the Medium Density Zone: Domett Street, Hardy Street (East of Tasman Street), Tasman Street	Placing six story apartment buildings in an existing residential area would dramatically destroy the character and liveability of some of our landmark areas.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS20.013	Tim Bayley		Support	Accept	6 story building has no place in existing residential areas	Accept	*Section 6*

S94.002	William Rush	Residential Zones	Amend	Make the following amendments to the High Density Residential zone rules: - Amend the building height to 14m (4 storeys) - Amend the daylight admission rule to 4m and 45 degrees. - Side and rear yards to be at least 2m (not 1m).	Some of the rules in the High Density Residential Zone are too severe and will impact too much on neighbours, particularly where tall buildings are built on small sections. Consideration should be given to matters such as solar panels for renewable energy, where taller properties are allowed with limited Daylight admission rules, any panels that have been installed on existing properties could be severely affected. The increase in height does not seem commensurate to the amount of units that are permitted in the High Density Residential zone - if a height of 19.5m (as proposed in Rule REr.19J) is permitted, it would make sense to enable more than three residential units to be permitted as long as they meet the other permitted conditions in the Rule table. If Council is going to enable greater height that will likely cause a big difference to the character and amenity of the residential neighbourhoods where the High Density Residential Zone is proposed, then it should make it worthwhile i.e., enabling only three units as a permitted activity will not in my view encourage developers to consider options for building higher-density developments.	Reject	*Section 6*
S94.004	William Rush	Residential Zones	Not Stated	Consider only applying the High Density Residential Zone where sites are larger and/or adding a rule to the plan to encourage or incentivise amalgamation of sites.	The proposed High Density Residential zone is too tall, particularly given that the site sizes in the area it has been applied are generally small. Given the range of rules that apply in the zones, it will be difficult for development to occur up to the maximum building height on a small site unless a development breaches many of the other rules. The Council should consider only applying the High Density Residential Zone where sites are larger and/or adding a rule to the plan to encourage or incentivise amalgamation of sites as this will lead to better quality high density development.	Accept	*Section 6*

S96.002	Esther McNaughton	Mapping	Oppose	If Proposed Plan Change 29 is approved, the area west of Church Hill comprising Synagogue Lane, South St and Nile St West should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone.	I live in Synagogue Lane, a heritage area adjacent to South St and Nile St West. On this plan change our area has been designated high intensity. I believe that six storied buildings in this area would destroy the historic nature of our area. Part of the historic feel of the area is the sight of the cathedral and Church Hill from this area and I most particularly feel that medium and high density residential zoning are inappropriate in my historical area. More broadly, the Victorian feel of Nelson's CBD and the area behind the cathedral is part of the longstanding attraction of Nelson to visitors. This is the Nelson that many people know and love, and the intensification plan presented threatens this through its lack of controls. Among other things, this will be detrimental to the revenue provided by tourism in our region. The historical character of the area would be destroyed by the buildings allowed in the medium and high density zones.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS65.039	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: If Proposed Plan Change 29 is approved, the area west of Church Hill comprising Synagogue Lane, South St and Nile St West should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone. Reasons include (please also refer to our original submission #831 as in many cases multiple reasons have been noted): PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new study on effects of proposals on heritage and character of City is required. The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice. It has been undertaken by one person rather than a multidisciplinary team.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS78.062	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: If Proposed Plan Change 29 is approved, the area west of Church Hill comprising Synagogue Lane, South St and Nile St west should be rezoned as a General Residential Zone. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A comprehensive independent study of the effects of this proposal on the character and heritage buildings of Nelson that informs changes to proposed rules and policies (on and off-site height, boundary set back, daylight angles) is required. The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice. It has been undertaken by one person rather than a multidisciplinary team.	Reject	*Section 6*

S103.001	Jessie Thornton	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Remove the ability to build] 6 story apartment blocks.	I understand the need for more housing in NZ and especially Nelson. However strongly disagree with having the right to build these big apartment blocks in residential areas. Nelson City is easily accessible via public transport, so why can these dwellings not be built outside of the city and away from urban areas. It took a lot of hard work to purchase our 1950's standard home in Stoke, so much hard work has gone into the house and the property filling it with veggie gardens and fruits trees. There is potential for a 6 story dwelling to be built next to us that would remove all sunlight from our property. My family would be beyond devastated and this is how many other families will feel if this is able to go through. It's a selfish not thought-out plan. Expand outside of Nelson where there is room, why does the need for cramming already busy areas need to be factored in. I work in our Public Hospital and have children in daycare and schools, as council would know our "new" hospital is years away from being built and where are plans to expand and accommodate more people entering the region. Education and healthcare services are already stretched to capacity let alone adding more people to the region.	Reject	*Section 6*
S108.001	Sarah Tobin	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] only allow 2 and 3 storey buildings in residential zones without a resource consent.	6 storey buildings would ruin views and sunlight of surrounding dwellings. The effects of which would also reduce their properties value. There is no need to intensify residential zones to that extent in Nelson. Buildings higher than 3 stories should have to go through the Resource consent process.	Reject	*Section 6*

S112.001	Andy Clover	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Oppose the loss of existing sunlight protection for all properties and oppose the creation of a high density residential zone with the allowance to build up to 19.5m.	I seek to ensure existing residential amenity (sunlight, views) is protected, and must be considered as part of any planned development. I oppose the creation of an HDRZ with the allowance to build up to 19.5m where that could be alongside and completely overshadowing a neighbouring 1 or 2 storey house, because that could utterly destroy the existing homeowner's amenity, ability to grow veges, use solar power, enjoy a BBQ in the sun, or enjoy the simple pleasure of sunlight streaming through a window. The mental health benefits of this sort of activity are well known and should not be underestimated. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S113.021	Barbara Greene	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Do not] try to retrofit high density / multi-storey buildings into existing suburbs / neighbourhoods	Refer to reasons in submission point S113.020.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S142.001	Errol Gilchrist	Residential Zones	Oppose	Retain existing Daylight/Sunlight angles at existing property boundaries.	Many homes (ours included) in this Zone have been specifically designed and sited to take advantage of both summer and winter sun under the current planning rules. Sunlight warms our living areas and gardens and is essential for our health and well being. We specifically bought our home because it was north facing and sunny, in an established low density residential area close to the city, close to family living in the area. The proposed change from low density to a High Density Residential Zone would definitely have an adverse affect on our health and well being. Retaining the existing daylight rules does not preclude more intense development - development can still take place on suitable, larger sites where the impact on existing residents is minimised. Allowing high rise development without consents within existing low density residential areas should surely not even be considered "good" planning, as the effects of poor quality development and severe shading would have detrimental outcomes on neighbourhoods, and residents.	Reject	*Section 6*
S192.009	Jane Jay	Residential Zones	Oppose	Limit KO and all others to three storeys in all but inner city zones. Don't import unemployed to Nelson City.	Examiner Street should not be zoned six storeys. KO building here at six storeys will kill sunlight, views, and the family character of this area as they proposed 1 and 2 bed flats.	Reject	*Section 6*
S197.005	Adrian Parlane	Residential Zones	Amend	[Amend] high density zone [rules to] 3 storeys with adequate onsite parking, community garden space and recognition of green areas.	In high density zones, I would support 3 storey developments with adequate onsite parking, community garden space and recognition of green areas.	Reject	*Section 6*
S244.005	Carolyn Marshall	Mapping	Oppose	Council should remove HDRZ from the plan completely (perhaps with the central city an exception) and should apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district on the introduction of PC29, on the basis that AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules will apply to all pre-existing	For the reasons provided in submission point S244.003, I oppose the current high and medium density zones.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS28.114	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Council should remove HDRZ from the plan completely (perhaps with the central city an exception) and should apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district on the introduction of PC29, on the basis that AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules will apply to all pre - existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary. The Tahunanui (flat) and Monaco residential areas are largely outside the PC29 boundaries and comprise either standard residential or low-density zoning. Applying a general residential zoning across all existing residential zones would provide for up to 3 residential units per site as a permitted activity. However, there are a number of areas that are not appropriate for further residential intensification, in particular those areas subject to the Nelson Airport Overlays.	Accept	*Section 6*

S251.005	Susan Corry	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Amend rule HRZ REr.19J permittedcategory, such that it be changed to either: a) maximum permitted height of 4 storeys; or b) maximum permitted height of 3 storeys (11m), ie. amalgamating the HRZ zone with the MRZ so it is all one MRZ with no HRZ (6 storeys).	Nelson is predominantly 1 or 2 storey residential houses, with some 4 storey commercial buildings (eg around NMIT) and only a few buildings of 6 storey height (eg NCC, Rutherford Hotel). It is predominantly lower height and that is the character of Nelson's residential areas. While we do need higher density I think the tallest buildings should be contained to the City or City fringe zones, not in the predominantly suburban/residential areas currently proposed as HRZ. eg not in Victory Square, Dodson Valley Road, Stoke centre, Manuka or Bronte, etc. As the plan notes say it won't all happen at once, so one or two six storey buildings sticking out like a sore thumb in amongst predominantly lower height residential areas will look weird, negatively visual effects, negatively affect the residential character, and have negative daylight effects/shading on surrounding houses if it sticks up higher than everything else in a predominately lower height residential area. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S251.006	Susan Corry	Residential Zones	Oppose	Amend REr.19K so that instead of a 60 degrees recession angle, theCouncil develop an outcome based rule which protects neighbours existingsunlight (eg a rule that says development shall not reduce an existing properties sunlight to lessthan than 2-5 hours of direct sunlight between the hours of 9-3 during worst wintermonths, as proven by shadow diagrams).	[Refer to the reasons in S251.004 and the following]. In Victoria any new developments need to design so residents will have at least 5 hours daylight between 9-3 on 22 September equinox. Thus, by focusing on a desired outcome the developer can design to take into account site characteristics, neighbours locations, boundaries etc, maybe make it higher in one part, lower in another. It becomes up to the developer to design so it does not significantly reduce the sunlight to neighbouring properties (ref: Littlefishproperties.com.au/blog/overshadow neighbours. ref: Victorian building regulations 2018 - Reg 83 - overshadowing of recreational private open space) People should not be disadvantaged by other peoples development proposals, as a permitted activity without any say or comeback. That is not the society NZ is. While assisting development to happen via these rules Council should also aim to protect existing property rights and the health and wellbeing of all in society. Maybe the rule cannot protect 100% existing rights, but it can aim to protect a reasonable level (ie retaining sunlight to other properties during middle of day in winter)	Reject	*Section 6*

S269.005	Lew Metcalfe	Mapping	Oppose	[Reduce] the HRZ [to apply] only to the Inner City and Inner-City Fringe Zones.	The High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) is too large and extends unduly beyond the Inner City Zone. It is well understood that housing intensification in Nelson city will be incremental rather than something that will occur overnight. Therefore, it is suggested that PC29 should strongly reflect the 'slow moving' future demand and capacity requirements of housing construction, especially as PC29 is intended to be an "interim response" and lack of neighbourhood planning. The large and extensive area within HRZ zone allows for developers to cherry-pick sites as they become available or as they purchase them. This will result in up to six storey housing developments to be located randomly within the zone rather than focusing HRZ intensification policies and rules on the inner city where potential adverse impacts can be minimised or contained across a smaller area and therefore affecting fewer people but still achieving the desired outcomes and advantages of inner-city growth. If we observe cities around the world the tall buildings are clustered in one area. The policies and rules for housing intensification will always be subject to review and in the future this can happen to accommodate changing needs but the proposed HRZ is significantly too extensive for the demands and capacity requirements of the next 30 years. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S269.008	Lew Metcalfe	Residential Zones	Oppose	Include a rule for multi-storey residential applications in the HRZ requiring applicants to provide an analysis of the social and amenity well-being impacts of the development.	PC29 analysis (s32 report) has failed to consider any of the social aspects of the new zones. The possibility, either real or potential, of a multi-storey residential building being constructed and occupied immediately adjacent to or in the nearby vicinity of other residential homes will have multiple and often substantial social impacts on those people and communities. The proposed HRZ extends across many existing residential properties and those homeowners have very valid and realistic concerns that they could lose important mental health, amenity and well-being values, such as sunshine, outlook, privacy and the like, if a high-rise residential building was constructed next to them or nearby. The risk of this can be minimised by well-considered zone boundaries and neighbourhood planning occurring before the policies and rules are operative.	Reject	*Section 6*
S274.014	Robert Renshaw	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Plan multi-storey buildings to blend into the surrounding environment].	There is no need to building multi-storey buildings willy nilly all over the place especially in residential areas, they need proper planning to blend into the surrounding environment. They will only be built if there is demand for them.	Reject	*Section 6*

S293.001	Alan Stevens	Mapping	Oppose	Delete the high density residential area proposals and revert to the existing Plan provisions.	The Council's role is to work on behalf of the people it represents and reflect the community's wishes, not to arrogantly go ahead and generate a proposed plan change that drastically changes the existing policies with no discussion or community consultation in order to ascertain the community's wishes for the future. The commercial areas of the city are the only areas that are well suited to the sort of high rise and intensive development that the plan change proposes. The existing rules provide ample opportunity for intensive developments to go through a rigorous resource consent process to ensure that the amenity values of existing areas of lower density development are protected.	Reject	*Section 6*
S299.002	Rose Sorren-Norness	Residential Zones	Support in part	Oppose any building height over three stories (twelve meters) in the High Density Residential zone.	Support the intensification of residential housing in the high density residential zone but oppose any building height over three stories, (twelve meters). I believe this would devalue the overall liveability of Nelson as a desired place to live and negatively impact property values. Furthermore, I question the need for tripling the height of buildings in this area to meet foreseeable future population growth when taking into account the undeveloped land remaining in and around Nelson as well as adding additional building height to inner city buildings.	Reject	*Section 6*

S300.001	Kenneth Norness Jr	Residential Zones	Support in part	Oppose any building height over three stories (twelve meters) in the High Density Residential zone.	Support the intensification of residential housing in the high density residential zone but oppose any building height over three stories, (twelve meters). I believe this would devalue the overall liveability of Nelson as a desired place to live and negatively impact property values. Furthermore, I question the need for tripling the hight of buildings in this area to meet foreseeable future population growth when taking into account the undeveloped land remaining in and around Nelson as well as adding additional building height to inner city buildings.	Reject	*Section 6*

S313.001	Sloane Bayley	Residential Zones	Oppose	Restrict any high density living (ie dwellings 3 stories or higher) to the Mixed Use and Centre City zones already set out in the draft Whakamahere Whakatu Nelson Plan and leave the areas currently marked "high density" under PC 29 as they currently are.	A. Inconsistencies, confusion, short time frame and lack of notice in the consultation process... I do not believe there has been enough publicity around these changes to ensure people are fully informed... I have received nothing targeted to indicate there is potentially a big change to my property zoning... The documents available online are not easy to follow. The draft Nelson Plan envisages only medium density zoning through the area now zoned "high density" in PC29, with a building height of up to 11m, whereas in the medium density zones in PC29 the proposed building height is now up to 12m. These inconsistencies create confusion and misunderstanding of what is now being proposed. When there was general publicity about the draft Nelson Plan and the Future Development Strategy for Nelson, I did not understand that the intensification of "Nelson City Centre" would apply to me... By using general terms like "city centre", and by mixing up the terms and the areas to which intensification applies, the Council has made it very difficult for anyone but professionals used to dealing with city planning/the Resource Management Act to follow what is going on. I only know because someone else affected by plan changes told me. B Impact on amenity values I understand that Nelson's population is growing and we need to be able to increase the density of housing in our inner city. I would be supportive of 4-6 story high rise developments in the middle of town (perhaps to the edge of Nile Street, bordering the city), where we already have a multitude of high rise and commerical buildings. However I do not believe we should allow developers to build these 6 story high rise developments through our existing family neighbourhoods, especially without resource consent. Density of housing can be increased in these areas without the need for such tall high rise developments. There is an opportunity to enhance these neighbourhoods with, for example, 2 story apartments and	Reject	*Section 6*

S314.002	Gardner/Mitchell Group	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Reduce the maximum permitted building height from 6 storeys to] 2-3 storey for suburbs within the High Density Residential Zone.	Nelson suburbs are low lying and unsuitable for 6 storey buildings to be positioned among low profile residential areas. This would destroy the very quality of life that all Nelson suburbs residents enjoy. Trees, sun, green spaces, view of hills and sea would be gone for ever and cannot be reversed once in place.	Reject	*Section 6*
S322.002	Cathy Nicholson	Residential Zones	Amend	Limit apartment buildings to no more than four(4) stories and 5m in height.	Research shows as residential buildings increase in height, there is considerable increase in depression, isolation, crime and anti social behaviour. Also negative effects on sleep and loss of community.	Reject	*Section 6*
S323.001	Sue Thomas	Mapping	Oppose	Oppose the plan to allow up to 6 storey buildings being built in Washington Valley with or without resource consent.	I oppose this plan on four different grounds: 1) lack of provision for parking which will in turn cause major traffic problems. 2) lack of provision for traffic flow. 3) lack of provision to allow for flooding which occurs in the area. 4) lack of consideration of the social cohesiveness of the Washington Valley community. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.033	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support in part	Accept in part	Submitter has vast heritage knowledge and reading their submission on Nelson Heritage listings was concerning and shows the total lack of research, consultation, competence or care by NCC with the PC29.	Reject	*Section 6*
S328.001	Hanni Kaspar	Residential Zones	Amend	Reduce height in the High Density Residential zone from 19.5m to 11m+1m.	Much of the planned high density area is built over with existing free standing 1 and 2 storey houses. A six storey neighbour will shade these properties immensely.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S331.003	James Taylor	Mapping	Oppose	Do not make any of the surburban neighbourhoods a High Density Zone.	1. Other more suitable opportunities for intensification do exist. I feel that the CBD offers plenty of land and empty buildings that can be used for housing. 2. It will ruin the character of many of the beautiful neighbourhoods around Nelson. 3. It is important to maintain current levels of green space in neighbourhoods for peoples' well being: for example, for gardens, for growing food, for the ecology of our town and for eveyone's collective enjoyment.	Reject	*Section 6*

S332.001	Tracy Neal	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Reduce the maximum building heights in the High Density Residential zone].	I support the concept of planning and the need to consider future scenarios, and I support aspects of the proposal but it appears very little thought has gone into the consequences of the proposed maximum heights for buildings in the High Density Residential Zone. There should be scope within a plan like this to reconsider where Nelson's future lies, and what could be done to create its point of difference. It is a port city with a strong maritime heritage that is different to other provincial cities/town in NZ, yet there is no reference to any open-minded approach to what could be achieved, using good design input as a basis. Closer consideration is needed of many aspects of what is proposed. These reasons have been well highlighted at various community meetings, including the use of potentially "dodgy demography" in how the council arrived at its decision on proposed population growth. Right now there is little to attract people to Nelson City, there is little reason to live here or even visit. Tasman has greater advantages in terms of attractiveness and opportunity to attract people because our environment is first rate, and it's all we have. That is our point of difference.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S334.002	Fiona Hosie	Mapping	Oppose	Deletion of the HDZ from PC 29.	I oppose the creation of a High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), in particular [in the location of] Tamaki Street. I oppose the absence of any detailed comment as to the prospective loss in value that properties in the proposed HDZ will suffer if/when a six storey apartment block (with no on-site parking) is built (as of right - with no opportunity for neighbourhood input) 1 metre from the boundary. I oppose the absence of any detailed comment as to the visual and amenity effect on neighbouring properties of permitted height of 19.5 metres and recession plane only commencing at 12 metres. The only "planning" logic in the boundaries/location of the HDZ is proximity to transport and commercial centres. The provisions of the proposed plan change will not provide "cheaper" accommodation for anyone.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S334.003	Fiona Hosie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[If the HDZ is not deleted], than a maximum height of 10 metres in the areas proposed to be HDZ.	I oppose any maximum height (in any residential zone) in excess of 10 metres. The justification for the high starting point for recession angles and the degree of such angles becomes irrelevant if the maximum height is 10 metres (or lower). A height of 10 metres allows for two storey houses/apartments - or three storey if designed with expertise and care.	Reject	*Section 6*
S334.005	Fiona Hosie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to ensure that any non-compliance with Rules REr.19J (as to height) and/or REr.19K (as to daylight admissions) be considered as "non-complying" - and not as	I oppose the inclusion of "restricted discretionary" in the PC29 in relation to any residential zone.	Reject	*Section 6*
S334.008	Fiona Hosie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to ensure that failure to comply strictly with all other Rules in Rules REr.19 set out in PC29 will make the proposal "non-complying"	I oppose the inclusion of "restricted discretionary" in the PC29 in relation to any residential zone.	Reject	*Section 6*

S339.001	Mark Alderson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Oppose all] of the Plan Change 29, with specific emphasis on questioning the need for high density in Nelson, and the potential socioeconomic impact on our community.	As this is the biggest plan change the council has ever undertaken, it is more important than ever that they approach this professionally and objectively. As a resident who deeply values the well-being and sustainable growth of our city, I believe that a comprehensive and transparent consultation process is essential for any proposed changes to the urban landscape. The need for High Density in a city of this size. Nelson is a historic city, rich in a variety of cultures and interests that attracts thousands of visitors every year. As current inhabitants of this city, we must be mindful of the decisions we make right now, not just for us but for our future generations. With conflicting information used by the council, regarding data, actual population growth, and considering the previous government guidelines on social housing and the way towns and cities in New Zealand should action this. I question the council's processes and logic regarding intruding High and Medium Destiny into the wider residential areas of the city.	Reject	*Section 9 - Overview and Strategic S42A Report*
FS40.002	Belinda Reburn		Support	Accept	I support this Submission in full.	Reject	*Section 9 - Overview and Strategic S42A Report*
FS78.002	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission I support are: various. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences; amenity and value in the CBD and residential areas will be lost if it goes ahead.	Reject	*Section 9 - Overview and Strategic S42A Report*
S340.021	John Hugo	Residential Zones	Amend	[Change the High Density Residential Zone to enable] Three storey townhouse style development around open spaces	Refer to reasons in submission point S340.020.	Reject	*Section 6*
S352.010	Derek & Karen Austin	Mapping	Amend	[Rezone HDZ to MDZ].	We would support [the plan change] if HDZ became MDZ.	Accept	*Section 6*

S352.012	Derek & Karen Austin	Mapping	Oppose	[Remove] HDZ from the Nile, Trafalgar, Examiner and Rutherford proposed blocks.	We oppose the HDZ because the conditions lack logic for Nile, Trafalgar, examiner and Rutherford blocks.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S356.001	Sarah Yarrow	Mapping	Oppose in part	Remove the block of Domett Street/Hardy Street/Tasman Street/Nile Street from the High Density Residential Zone and rezone as Comprehensive Area/Residential Lower Density Area.	This area is in the earthquake fault overlay and liquification overlay. Allowing for intensified residential development in this area will expose the Council (and therefore ratepayers) to significant risk and potential costs in the future.	Reject	*Section 6*
S361.006	Michael Scott	Residential Zones	Support in part	Support RE1.8 in general, in particular the reference to small-scale commercial, but amend to include "...and access to quality public open space."	In higher density areas it is important that places offer residents and passersby the opportunity to linger. This makes for a more interesting neighbourhood, is more people-centred, is safer and feels safer. Small-scale commercial offers those opportunities, and so does quality public open space.	Accept	*Section 6*
S368.001	Philip McKinlay	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zones area from Plan Change 29 and either; leave the existing zoning (as currently applies to 25 Bronte Street) or, replace it with the General Residential Zone that allows for up to three, two storey, buildings on a site, provided existing sunlight, daylight and outlook provisions are retained and protected.	I understand the requirement for Central Government and Councils to plan for population growth and to consider options for improving access to housing for people who currently struggle to access affordable homes. In addition, I am aware that Nelson is exposed to risk from geological (earthquakes and land slips) and climate events such as flooding so any development needs to consider ways to mitigate these risks. Nelson City Council has overreached the legal requirements to provide high- density housing as it is not a Tier 1 City (it is only a Tier 2 city). Therefore, Council should only consider the requirements for a Tier 2 city. Council and the planning rules alone will not necessarily overcome what is a global problem of a lack of affordable housing. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S371.001	Janet Moloney	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the proposed high density zone; in particular for the area around the cathedral, and in particular the proposed height of 19.5m.	I am concerned about the negative impact of high density buildings on existing properties in this area; including impact on sunlight, privacy, neighbourhood character, garden productivity and solar panel effectiveness.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

FS65.139	Heritage Nelson		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: Oppose the proposed high density zone; in particular for the area around the cathedral, and in particular the proposed height of 19.5m (as negative impact on character among other reasons). Reasons include (please also refer to our original submission #831 as in many cases multiple reasons have been noted): PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new study on effects of proposals on heritage and character of City is required. The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice. It has been undertaken by one person rather than a multidisciplinary team.	Accept	*Section 6*
S372.001	Evan McKenzie	Residential Zones	Oppose	Amend rule REr.19J - maximum permitted building height from 19.5 metres down to a maximum of 12 or lower that would accommodate a 3 level residential building,	Six level, 19.5m buildings erected within existing residential communities will cause severe loss of amenity value to those existing properties in particular but also the real risk of significant property devaluation. There are locations such as inner city, commercial/industrial fringes, etc, where 19.5m residential buildings would cause no detrimental effects on neighbours. There are alternatives to excessive height for increasing density - the obvious example being terraced housing that is ubiquitous in the UK and elsewhere. I note that various developments in Stoke employ terraced 2 storey housing.	Reject	*Section 6*

S375.001	Timothy Vincent	Residential Zones	Amend	Reduce the allowable height from six stories to two.	Allowing six stories means the cost/loss of amenity of living in the shadow of a six story building will be pushed unfairly onto the small number of unfortunate residents that happen to live in the shadow of a site that is developed. The FAQ page gives the example of 15% intensification over 30 years, if that's evenly spit between infill, apartment and terraced housing that means 5% of residents will live in the shadow of an apartment building. That's profoundly unfair that the plan change will result in that outcome for 5% of people living in the newly zoned areas. It's not a nice outcome. A much better option would be to allow intensification with two-story buildings. I've seen examples of that in Christchurch where they fit two or three or four two-story units onto a site. It's relatively high density and doesn't result in massive negative effects on the neighbours. The Green Gables site at the east end of Bridge St is a great local example. That has been developed with a new two story building which has next to no effect on the neighbours amenity. Compare that with how it might look with a six story building if that were allowed (very roughly mocked up and not to scale, intended for illustration purposes only). It's Russian Roulette for residents whether a developer builds and blocks out their sunshine, and the costs will be disproportionately and unfairly borne by an unlucky few. Amending the plan to allow two story units will still allow for a massive increase in living density from current levels and with less of the cost externalised to the poor neighbours.	Reject	*Section 6*

S396.002	Arnold Ayre	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the loss of protection of sunlight angles into our houses and gardens.	We live in a proposed High Density Residential Zone. Our lifestyle is based around the our garden as a place of recreation, beauty, and food production. This would be destroyed if we were hemmed in by multi-storey developments on our east and/or north boundaries. We have also installed solar panels which have the potential to become compromised. This lifestyle has the potential to be destroyed by the proposed plan change, as, I suggest, is the lifestyle of many other Nelsonians. It is possible to locate multi-storey apartment buildings where it does not have this detrimental effect on neighbors, for example the apartment blocks that have been built on the hillside around Haven and Rocks Roads.	Reject	*Section 6*
S399.002	Wendy Drummond	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Consider reducing the maximum number of stories in the high density residential zone to four stories].	Four stories could be as of right in high density, where sunlight is not being blocked for other dwellings. Higher should require consent.	Reject	*Section 6*
S407.004	Earle Family Home Trust	Residential Zones	Oppose	Delete REr.19B and retain the current residential zone rules.	It is considered that this rule, combined with the other High Density provisions making up PC29, will lead to a substantial and adverse change to the residential environment around 1 Brookside.	Reject	*Section 6*
S407.005	Earle Family Home Trust	Residential Zones	Oppose	Delete REr.19C and retain the current residential zone rules.	It is considered that this rule, combined with the other High Density provisions making up PC29, will lead to a substantial and adverse change to the residential environment around 1 Brookside.	Reject	*Section 6*
S407.006	Earle Family Home Trust	Residential Zones	Oppose	Delete REr.19E and retain the current residential zone rules	It is considered that this rule, combined with the other High Density provisions making up PC29, will lead to a substantial and adverse change to the residential environment around 1 Brookside.	Reject	*Section 6*
S407.007	Earle Family Home Trust	Residential Zones	Oppose	Delete REr.19J and retain the current residential zone rules.	It is considered that this rule, combined with the other High Density provisions making up PC29, will lead to a substantial and adverse change to the residential environment around 1 Brookside.	Reject	*Section 6*

S410.003	Kathleen Mardon	Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove and replace rule REr.19k.1 - daylight admission with daylight angles and recession planes as per Appendix 15.	Loss of sunlight to neighbouring properties. Contradiction with Policy/ObjectiveRE2.3, "the reception of sunlight to each household unit is a critical component of residential amenity that provides warmth and energy efficiency, and is VITAL for outdoor activities such as gardening and recreation". Adverse effects: (a) potentially complete loss of sunlight to neighbouring property through winter a higher energy use (for heating) which is contrary to the reduction of climate change; (b) ineffectiveness of solar panels and other energy efficiency design features; (c) increase in mould and dampness which can lead to illness; (d) food security: sunlight is vital for home gardens; (e) impact on a person's mental well being; (f) the loss of sunlight is more pronounced on a north facing property with a 6-storey building on it's northern boundary. This has not been taken into consideration in the daylight admission rule.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS65.216	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Abolish the High and Medium Density Zones and have one standard residential zone [ruining unique character and shape of areas among other aspects]. Reasons include (please also refer to our original submission #831 as in many cases multiple reasons have been noted): PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources A new study on effects of proposals on heritage and character of City is required. The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice. It has been undertaken by one person rather than a multidisciplinary team.	Reject	*Section 6*

S410.004	Kathleen Mardon	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the HDZ and MDZ and replace with one standard residential zone.	Loss of outlook for neighbouring properties - Re Rule REr.19L - (a) With a 12 m or 19.5m building within 1 metre of a boundary, a neighbouring property could completely loose its outlook. Outlook is an important amenity value. (b) It is recognised in Policy RE2.4 that the location and design of buildings should not unduly compromise outlook and privacy of adjoining development".	Reject	*Section 6*
S410.005	Kathleen Mardon	Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove Rules REr.19J.1 and REr.18J.1 - maximum building height in the HDZ and MDZ. Allow for higher density in some areas in the future, dwellings over 8m could be a non-complying activity.	I object to these building heights being a permitted activity, not requiring a resource consent, and denying affected neighbours the right to object. The proposed building heights would have serious advserse effects on neighbouring properties, including 1. Loss of sunlight to neighbouring properties 2. Loss of outlook for neighbouring properties 3. General impact on amenity values 4. Impact on the general shape of the zone, and out of keeping with established character of the proposed HDZ.	Reject	*Section 6*
S410.006	Kathleen Mardon	Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove and replace Rule REr.19J.4 - infringement to building height with the building heights relating to the Standard Residential Zone.	This rule could allow buildings to be greater than 19.5 in certain circumstances, thereby increasing the negative affects on neighbouring properties.	Reject	*Section 6*
S410.007	Kathleen Mardon	Residential Zones	Oppose	Rule REr.19J.4 - infringement to building height. This rule should be removed, and replaced with the building heights relating to the Standard Residential Zone.	This rule could allow buildings to be greater than 19.5 in certain circumstances, thereby increasing the negative affects on neighbouring properties.	Reject	*Section 6*
S410.008	Kathleen Mardon	Residential Zones	Oppose	Reinstatement of original wording in objective RE1.2 Object to: c. deletion of the whole clause "does not diminish the amenity of neighbouring sites; e. deletion of the whole clause "does not significantly affect the views or outlook from adjacent properties".	By removing these statements from the Policies and Objectives it ensures that the effects of a 12m or 19.5m development on the amenity values, outlook and views of neighbouring sites do not have to be taken into consideration at all when assessing an application. The changes to these clauses directly contradict the aim in RE2.9 to "create a high standard of amenity for residents within and adjoining a development."	Reject	*Section 6*

S410.009	Kathleen Mardon	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Request for] Consistency between Policies & Objectives (Chapter 7 Residential Zone) with proposed rules.	The proposed rules are in conflict with various policies including: RE2.9, flexibility in development, which aims to "enable development of existing or new sites to create a high standard of amenity for residents within and adjoining a development: RE2.3, daylight and sunlight, which recognises that "buildings and structures should be designed and sited so that adjoining sites are not unduly shaded and there is reasonable access to daylight". RE2.3.i recognises that "the reception of daylight and sunlight to each household unit is a critical component of residential amenity that provides warmth and energy efficiency, and is vital for outdoor activities such as gardening and recreation". RE2.4 privacy and outlook States that "the location and design of buildings should not unduly compromise outlook and privacy of adjoining development ....." RE2.4.1 states that "height of buildings and closeness to boundaries are the key determinants of privacy, outlook and views". Having a 19.5m dwelling 1 metre from a boundary WILL "unduly compromise outlook and privacy of adjoining development".	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S410.010	Kathleen Mardon	Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove clause(s) from rules such as REr.19B.3 - about "not limiting the ability to achieve the planned built character of the area/zone".	This gives planners power to approve any restricted discretionary activity if they deem that not granting it would "limit the ability to achieve the planned built character of the area".	Reject	*Section 6*
S419.002	John Karolyi	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Support] 35m2 if it is a tiny home, but minimum 45m2 if a permanent residence isdesired, with [an] area for bikes or the like "amenity" area being required, so asnot to contravene the governments no parking required rules.	Minimum sizing of 35m2 for permanent accommodation is too small, people cannot become "established" with such a small space, there also tends to be overflow to the exterior, washing hanging over balconies, bikes, cars, rubbish, surplus stuff need to go somewhere.	Reject	*Section 6*
S428.004	Stephen Mullins	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Request] that the high density zone height be reduced to a maximum 4 stories and that these developments be notifiable	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

S436.001	Brent Doherty	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend rules to require that there be] no buildings above two levels on the Tahunanui Hills.	The creation of a High Density Residential Zone (HDZ) that has a maximum height greater than 12 metres is not mandated under NPS-UD 2020. Many of us choose to live on the Tahunanui Hills because of the sunlight, warmth and energy it provides established trees and birdlife. Intensification will rob the existing population of the very things that we choose to live here in the first place. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S443.002	Belinda Reburn	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Request]: That the Tier 1 or 19.5m [High Density Zone] buildings be droppedentirely from the Plan Change 29 Proposal. Proposal: That we focus Plan Change 29 on 11.0m high buildings, that are more in keeping with the scale and form of Nelson.	Under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020, where Nelson is identified in the Tier 2 Table, High Density or 19.5m high buildings, are not identified. 19.5m high building heights do not fit with our small city scape and do not have a place in Nelson. To enact this part of the proposed plan change would see us lose our identity, take away the special character that exists and remove the qualities that we treasure about our city. The Nelson Plan Change 29 proposal for 19.5m buildings may be seen to answer requirements for additional housing. However, it does not answer the loss of identity that our city would experience. Cityscapes are important. With such a small city footprint we need to protect the iconic views, the parts of our city scape that shape and anchor our city edges, provide visual cues to our conservation reserves and differentiate us from every other colourless city within New Zealand and across the globe. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	*Section 6*

FS39.015	Richard Harden and Rachel Reese		Support	Accept	This submission point correctly identifies the ad hoc and adverse effects that PC29 is enabling. A failure by NCC to engage with its communities and to undertake spacial and neighbourhood planning prior to initiating the plan change compromises good urban development outcomes, including increasing housing supply.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS78.232	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support is: Drop Tier 1 / or 19.5m [High Density Zone] building requirements [the loss of identity that Our city would experience. Cityscapes are important. With such a small city footprint I need to protect the iconic views, the parts of Our city scape that shape and anchor Our city edges, provide visual cues to Our conservation reserves and differentiate us from every other colourless city within New Zealand and across the globe.] There is no justification for the removal of the Church Hill view shaft. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new study on effects of proposals on heritage and character of City is required. The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice. It has been undertaken by one person rather than a multidisciplinary team.	Accept	*Section 6*

FS65.236	Heritage Nelson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission we support is: Drop Tier 1 / or 19.5m [High Density Zone] building requirements [the loss of identity that our city would experience. Cityscapes are important. With such a small city footprint we need to protect the iconic views, the parts of our city scape that shape and anchor our city edges, provide visual cues to our conservation reserves and differentiate us from every other colourless city within New Zealand and across the globe.] Reasons include (please also refer to our original submission #831 as in many cases multiple reasons have been noted): There is no justification for the removal of the Church Hill view shaft. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new study on effects of proposals on heritage and character of City is required. The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice. It has been undertaken by one person rather than a multidisciplinary team.	Accept	*Section 6*
S443.006	Belinda Reburn	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Request]: That the Nelson City Council undertake consultation and meetings with the individual communities of Nelson and that the Plan Change 29 becomes a document that is reflective of this consultation. Overarching this is that 11m height buildings form the Medium Density Zone.	[Request] that we ensure Plan Change 29 is informed and developed through consultation with our communities, understanding who they are, what they want to see for the future of Nelson. Overarching this is that the 19.5m building height (High Density) be removed from Plan Change 29. [Refer to original submission for more detail.]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS39.017	Richard Harden and Rachel Reese		Support	Accept	This submission point correctly identifies the ad hoc and adverse effects that PC29 is enabling. A failure by NCC to engage with its communities and to undertake spacial and neighbourhood planning prior to initiating the plan change compromises good urban development outcomes, including increasing housing supply.	Accept	*Section 6*

FS78.472	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission I support are: various. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences; amenity and value in the CBD and residential areas will be lost if it goes ahead.	Accept	*Section 6*
S448.008	Anne and Andrew Weir	Residential Zones	Oppose	Nearby property owners should always be notified when a medium or high density development is proposed and those owners should always have the right to require the developer obtain resource consent for the development.	The proposed rules for medium and high density zones do not give enough protection to the sunlight, views and privacy of existing property owners. This would allow green fields development to proceed but would give some protection and certainty for existing residents.	Reject	*Section 6*
S450.006	Bernard Brewster	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the HDRZ from the plan completely.	I strongly oppose the High Density Residential Zone, [it is] so totally out of keeping with any existing neighbourhood, and also as something quite beyond the legal mandate.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S455.040	Philippa Hoult	Residential Zones	Oppose	The inclusion in PC29 of a maximum height of 10 metres in the areas proposed to be HDZ.	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S455.042	Philippa Hoult	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to ensure that any non-compliance with Rules REr.19J (as to height) and/or REr.19K (as to daylight admissions) be considered as "non-complying" - and not as	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S455.044	Philippa Hoult	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to ensure that failure to comply strictly with all other Rules in Rules REr.19 set out in PC29 will make the proposal "non-complying"	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

S457.033	Laraine Rothenberg	Mapping	Oppose	[Rezone the High Density Residential area bound by Nile Street, Bronte Street, Trafalgar Street, and Collingwood Street to General Residential.]	The high density area from the city center should not continue pass Hardy Street and Selwyn Street and certainly not extend beyond Nile street. It should definitely not include the area between Nile Street and Bronte Street as bounded by Trafalgar and Shelbourne and Collingwood Streets where they intersect with Bronte Street given the elevation of Bronte Street. A building of 6 storeys would be effectively massively greater then 6 storeys given the high elevation of Bronte Street as compared to Nile Street. It is inconceivable to me that it can be appropriate to install buildings of 6 storeys or 3 storeys on land which is significantly above sea level. This should not be replaced by a Medium Density Residential Zone but should be limited to General Residential Zone of two storeys. It seems like the planner known nothing of the area when it took what is known as the Dress Circle with scattered heritage homes and made the area available to six storeys to totally ruin the neighbourhood and its wonderful homes and ambiance. Why this area was singled out for 6 storeys is a mystery to me and others. If Nelson is in need of buildings of 6 storeys, which I doubt, the buildings of 6 storeys and 3 storeys should not be placed in established neighbourhoods with heritage homes but in areas that are ripe for reconstruction due to decay or other reasons or already zoned for commercial buildings. Thus the Medium Density or High Density Zones must end at Nile street and not extend to Bronte Street between Collingwood and Trafalgar streets. Bronte Street should be considered and zoned similarly to Brougham Street.	Reject	*Section 6*

S461.003	Jocelyn Smith	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain existing] provisions for preserving sunshine, views, and privacy [for existing properties]. [inferred]	I think most of the problem arises from trying to implement new rules on existing properties. I don't think there is enough provision for preserving sunshine, views, privacy. People have purchased their properties based on the existing conditions and some property values will be decimated by the proposed changes. This will not be a fair and even distribution of property value loss, but will fall heavily on particular properties when a tower block is built next to them, blocking sunshine, blocking views, overlooking their properties.	Reject	*Section 6*
S463.002	Derek Smail and Julia Burbury	Mapping	Oppose	[Delete] the HDZ portion of the proposal entirely.	There are no substantial grounds to depart from Policy 1.2c of NRMP which provided that it was necessary that any development "does not diminish the amenity of neighbouring sites". Refer to reasons in submission points S463.003 - S463.006.	Reject	*Section 6*
S463.003	Derek Smail and Julia Burbury	Residential Zones	Oppose	That if not deleted, the maximum height in HDZ be changed to 10 metres.	[I oppose] all and any maximum height (in any residential zone) in excess of 10 metres - i.e. two storeys, or three if originality be included in the design. The proposal will affect my partner and I and the amenities we currently enjoy in that our neighbour[s] would be entitled to build 12 to 19.5 metres, thereby blocking sunlight and daylight from our property and detrimentally affecting the view and amenity of the property, and causing a loss of direct sunlight at times of the year. Refer to original submission for more detail. If any of those neighbours allowed such apartments to be constructed, the value of the property occupied by my partner and I would fall substantially.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS72.036	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- We agree that intensification is necessary but it must be in areas where it is planned, where there are services for those who need them and it does not unduly affect the surrounding community. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support: There are not a clear and safe crossing points for much of Tahunanui to access amenities such as doctors and schooling, with the SH6 cutting the community in half.	Reject	*Section 6*
S463.004	Derek Smail and Julia Burbury	Residential Zones	Oppose	That if not deleted, the height at the boundary in the HDZ be changed from 12 metres to 3 metres.	[I oppose] the inclusion of recession planes (in side yard and rear yards in any residential zone) which commence at a height greater than 3 metres above ground level. Refer to reasons in submission point S463.003.	Reject	*Section 6*
S463.005	Derek Smail and Julia Burbury	Residential Zones	Oppose	That if not deleted, the recession angles in the HDZ be changed to the existing 45 degrees.	[I oppose] the inclusion of recession planes (in any residential zone) which are greater than 50 degrees from the horizontal. Refer to reasons in submission point S463.003.	Reject	*Section 6*
S463.006	Derek Smail and Julia Burbury	Residential Zones	Oppose	That if not deleted, the side yards in the HDZ be changed to 1.5 metres.	[I oppose] the proposed reduction in rear and side yard setbacks in residential zones. Refer to reasons in submission point S463.003.	Reject	*Section 6*
S463.007	Derek Smail and Julia Burbury	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Undertake] appropriate amendments/additions to the objectives and policies to reflect the changes sought in submission point S463.002 to S463.006, S463.008, and S463.009.	[I oppose] all amendments to existing objectives and policies under Chapter 7 which have the effect of supporting a High Density Residential Zone (HDZ).	Reject	*Section 6*
S464.002	Rosemary Horn	Residential Zones	Amend	Restrict building height on steeper sections, such as Washington Valley and Hastings Street [inferred].	Agree in principle with intensification, although 6 storeys high may not be appropriate for some of the steeper sections that have been included, e.g. Washington Valley and Hastings Street.	Reject	*Section 6*
S466.005	Alan Stewart	Residential Zones	Oppose	All high rise buildings in current residential areas should have to have a resource consent.	The resource consent provision is an important tool [to] allow neighbours to have their say in HDZ buildings and the effects on them and the neighbourhood.	Reject	*Section 6*
S481.004	Pip Swale	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Request] all proposed HDZ have walkable access to a supermarket (not a local dairy). For example, Christchurch planners are only proposing HDZ within 800m of a supermarket.	I oppose the proposed HDZ in residential areas where there is no walkable access to amenities (supermarkets, schools and public transport).	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S484.001	Philomena Donlon	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Reduce the maximum height of buildings to 4 stories in the High Density Residential zone.	I am delighted to see the potential rule changes allowing for more dense living in the designated areas. My only concern is that going from the current one or two stories to six stories is too high. From my reading of the proposals, there could be 2 six-story buildings at my current address, our section is about 900 sq metres. I think that is too intense. In a building of 6 stories, most people are dependant on using a lift for access and evacuation is more complex. Housing people in lower height terrace-style buildings is much more neighbour-friendly and it is possible to substantially increase density without streets looking higgledy-piggledy.	Reject	*Section 6*
S492.011	Jonathan Chambers and Louisa Stoneham	Residential Zones	Amend	[Seeks] that the Maximum Building Length rule be modified to offer protection to small sections as follows: 'the lesser of 22 m or half the adjoining boundary length'.	The proposed PC29 attempts to give some protection to rear yard sun access by providing for a maximum building length of 22m. However, in properties such as ours, the northern boundary is only 26m. This offers no worthwhile protection - our full usable yard could lose all access to sunlight in the winter months.	Reject	*Section 6*

S495.010	New Zealand Institute of Architects	Residential Zones	Amend	[Revise REr.19B to] remove the limit on the number of dwellings permitted on a site.	The intent of PC29 is to encourage more dwellings while discouraging amenity impacts to neighbouring properties. By limiting the number of dwellings while permitting buildings up to 19.5m this clause actively enables adverse impacts on neighbours while restricting the number of units able to be built. It is considered highly unlikely that a developer will build a six-storey building which contains only three units. In fact, given the additional compliance costs associated with building a residential building of more than three stories (such as lift access, fire, engineering etc), it is unlikely that any residential building with only three units will be built above three stories. Therefore under the proposed plan it is highly likely that any developer wanting to build over three stories will need to get a resource consent as they will need more than three units to allow the project to be commercially feasible. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S495.011	New Zealand Institute of Architects	Residential Zones	Amend	Change the maximum permitted height within the High Density Residential Zone to be 12m (3 storeys) with 'Restricted Discretionary' up to 19.5m (6 storeys). Developments between 12-19.5m need to be in accordance with the Urban Design Guides and subject to a review by the Urban Design Panel [as per submission points S495.004 and S495.005].	This modification [and the modification suggested in submission point 10] will enable more units to be permitted to be built while ensuring the more significant development work, which is likely to have greater amenity impacts on neighbouring properties, to be subject to greater qualitative controls.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS47.006	Wainui Properties Limited		Oppose	Reject in part	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: maximum height. The land at 137-155 Nile Street is elevated below the road level and so limiting height to 12m is considered to be unnecessarily restrictive. However, in the event that a change is made to provide for a review by the UDP in circumstances of any building between 12m and 19.5m, it is critical that the activity status does not exceed the controlled activity.	Accept	*Section 6*

S498.004	Nelson Tasman 2050	Mapping	Amend	Prior to the completion of neighbourhood plans limit PC29's permitted activity status for medium and high density intensification to areas with advantageous orientation for outlook and amenity.	We understand the implications of a proactive planning approach on timing. It could be years until the first spatial neighbourhood plan comes into effect. In the meantime, PC29 needs to enable intensification (and thereby minimise sprawl), while managing and minimising associated risks, such as: • loss of future regeneration opportunities by overcapitalising potentially unfavourable sites (e.g. inner block sites) • loss of open green space and less permeable area resulting in more risk of flash flooding • the creation of low amenity urban areas that inadvertently increase demand for greenfield stand-alone housing at the edge of town. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS47.005	Wainui Properties Limited		Support	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support are: the interim targeted approach. Nelson Tasman 2050, as with many other submitters, consider that a spatial neighbourhood plan is required. However, Nelson Tasman 2050 considers that would take years to come into effect. We agree. In the interim, Nelson Tasman 2050 express their support for areas with "advantageous orientation for outlook and amenity and thereby concentrating higher density development along the street fronts so these developments can utilise the amenity of the road reserve". The land at 137-155 Nile Street is considered to have these attributes. In then event that PC29 does not proceed in its current form, it is considered that the site at 137-155 Nile Street should not be discounted as this is a valuable intensification opportunity which could contribute significantly (in the interim) to achieve the intensification objective.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS56.069	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Neighbourhood spatial plans are a lower order document and should not supersede the rule framework or act to delay implementation of PC29.	Accept	*Section 6*
S508.001	Rachel Sharples	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Oppose] the potential building of six storey houses.	The thought of towering six-storey houses overshadowing my property fills me with a sense of dread and anxiety, as it threatens to disrupt the very essence of what makes my home special. The introduction of six-storey houses would not only compromise the visual harmony but also create a stark contrast to the existing architectural landscape. This change would undoubtedly diminish the value of our properties and erode the sense of pride we have in our neighbourhood. Increased traffic congestion, limited parking availability, and strain on existing infrastructure are just a few of the issues. The towering height of these buildings would invade the privacy of neighboring homes, casting shadows and obstructing sunlight. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S522.001	Annette Win	Mapping	Oppose	Remove Tasman Street, from Manuka St to Bronte Street on the eastern side from medium density zoning and the western side from high density zoning, and retain the current zoning.	A number of houses have an instability overlay [in this area]. There is a fault line running through the area. This area is not central Nelson. This is a narrow section of road heavily used by school children on bikes, yet has no dedicated cycle way. We are concerned that extra cars parked on the road create an additional hazard for our children. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S523.001	Jeanette Spencer	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Oppose] six storey apartments next to IselPark.	My observation is that Isel Park is an important part of the wellbeing of the community. I notice that there are people of all ages using the Park for their well being. If large apartments are built on Bishops Way and next to Isel Park, they will change the balance of nature. The view to the mountains will be lost, along side the sense of openness. This area is a flood zone so not appropriate for intensification at a level of 6 stories. The densification of six stories in a small area will likely cause more pollution to the adjacent stream. This area may have significant to Iwi. If the zoning for six storied apartments went ahead in the Sadlier Street area, around Bishops Park, I would like to see Bishops Park specifically developed so it became an area for people to safely and harmoniously gather. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S523.002	Jeanette Spencer	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Oppose] six storey apartments in general.	Nelson is not required by government to have six storied apartments. This decision is out of balance for the region and will dramatically change the feel of the place. believe there needs to be well considered planning made that addresses the overall effect of high rise as well as the smaller, micro effects in each street and section. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S526.002	Michael Monaghan	Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove 19.5m buildings from Plan Change 29 document [and alternatively] propose that 11m buildings be the maximum height of buildings measured from natural ground level.	The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 identifies Nelson in the Tier 2 where buildings are provided at 12.5m high. High Density or 19.5m high buildings, are not identified. It is important that we protect the views and connections that we have with the surrounding Grampians, Centre of New Zealand, Brook Valley area and special qualities of the Coppermine area. Without the protection of these connections and views, enabling birds to use corridors into our city, we lose the qualities that differentiate us from other cities across the world. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	*Section 6*
FS78.292	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Remove 19.5 m buildings [Protect the views and connections that I have with the surrounding Grampians, Centre of New Zealand, Brook Valley area and special qualities of the Coppermine area]. Place, setting and surrounds are not considered. The geographical boundaries of proposed intensified housing zones cover large areas of character/heritage buildings. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new comprehensive independent study of the effects of this proposal on the character and heritage buildings of Nelson that informs changes to proposed rules and policies (on and off-site height, boundary set back, daylight angles). The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS65.319	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Remove 19.5 m buildings [Protect the views and connections that we have with the surrounding Grampians, Centre of New Zealand, Brook Valley area and special qualities of the Coppermine area]. Reasons include (please also refer to our original submission #831 as in many cases multiple reasons have been noted): Place, setting and surrounds are not considered. The geographical boundaries of proposed intensified housing zones cover large areas of character/heritage buildings. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new study on effects of proposals on heritage and character of City is required. The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice.	Reject	*Section 6*

S532.005	Kerry Haycock	Residential Zones	Oppose	Protect the amenity values of existing residential neighbourhoods [inferred].	The neighbourhood blocks from Nile Street up to Nelson College and between Rutherford Street and Collingwood Streets predominantly consist of older, well-established single-family homes and low-rise 1-2-story structures. Residents such as myself have chosen to live here for the smaller, regional town benefits and advantages that it provides, which include being able to raise children in family homes surrounded by greenery and open spaces, and not in high-rise buildings amongst the usual urban business you would find in our bigger cities. Introducing high rises that would tower over these family homes would erase the unique atmosphere of this area and could negatively impact the quality of life for existing residents. It would interrupt the aesthetic harmony of our neighbourhood and disrupt the skyline. The change from lower density to such high density will be a very significant change in how my neighbourhood looks and how I interact with my neighbours. Rezoning these areas to 'high-density' could lead to uncertainty and decreased property values as potential buyers are put off by the impacts of surrounding high-rise buildings and the prospects of increasing high-density living. These properties were never built contemplating a high-rise building next door and there would be no measures that an existing homeowner could take to minimise these impacts on their property and lifestyle. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS78.034	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Protect the amenity values of existing residential neighbourhoods [inferred]. Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS65.324	Heritage Nelson		Oppose in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Protect the amenity values of existing residential neighbourhoods [inferred]. Reasons include (please also refer to our original submission #831 as in many cases multiple reasons have been noted): Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents.	Reject	*Section 6*
S536.013	Leah Collier	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the high and medium density zones from Tanunanui Hills, Tosswill, and Tamkai.	I strongly oppose the High and Medium density for the Tahuanui hills, Tosswill, Tamkai etc.	Accept	*Section 6*
S536.022	Leah Collier	Residential Zones	Support	Retain the high density zoning of the area where Whareama rest home is [inferred].	The area next to Countdown where the Whareama rest home is I believe is a good site to intensify. It is only blocking the supermarkets sun and like council wants, it is close to a town hub.	Reject	*Section 6*
S536.027	Leah Collier	Residential Zones	Support	Support intensification along Haven Road between the Warehouse to Sublime.	Haven Road is a perfect example of an area that could be intensified. A single row of apartments all the way from the warehouse to sublime is a place I could get behind intensifying. It is not ruining existing houses views or sunlight and is close to town.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S539.001	Shannon Gourley	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the creation of a high density residential of 3-6 story buildings as proposed currently in the plan change 29 and request more investigation into the requirements around this.	High Density changes need to be further investigated. I understand change is needed for growth but not at the sacrifice of nelson's currents residents. The proposed changes will effect many longtime residents that have carefully chosen nelson to be their home in the location they purchased. My Street is High density and yet has no more room to connect to stormwater services and new builds currently had to install soak pits. No green spaces to be able to soak this up should we have a flood. 6 weeks to consider a document of over 2000 pages to digest and understand what is actually being proposed is not enough notification from council. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S545.003	Jeremy Butler	Residential Zones	Support in part	Develop guidelines or a design-led process that promotes quality medium density design. This is a qualitative assessment and could be achieved through a wider use of the Urban	Refer to reasons in submission point S545.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
S554.006	Leather Langbridge household - Rory Langbridge	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Oppose] the 6 storey building limit [and instead apply] a 4 storey limit in the high density zone. If the economics of a 6 storey height are explained, then consider this in far greater detail as potentially a restricted discretionary activity.	We do not support the blanket 6 story height limit placed within the high-density zone, from my observations of Wellington and other urban areas, my preference would be a 4 story limit. However, the economics of the 6 story height has been explained to me and for that reason we would strongly propose that rather than this be a blanket restriction, it be considered in far greater detail as potentially a restricted discretionary application. We note the observations made on this subject by the NZIA and fully endorse their suggested strategy.	Reject	*Section 6*

S555.011	Gerrard Wilson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Delete the High Density Residential zone, or review and amend the proposed rezoningof sites to High Density Residential zone, to ensure that it only applies where it is appropriate for that level of density to belocated in the context of the surrounding land uses, amenity and character, andin relation to the proximity to the City Centre.	The potential adverse effects of future development in that zone have been understated and underestimated. Consequently, the assessment of those affects has not been appropriately or adequately considered, and specifically: - A 19.5 metre high or 6-Level structure set back 1m from the boundary imposes significant and permanent shading and loss of daylight that will impact properties well beyond the adjoining sites and at a level that is more than minor. - On the face of it, the development controls describe a building envelope that would allow a significant and imposing single household dwelling of a much larger scale and \ level of site coverage than currently provided for. - For those areas of the proposed high-density zone are currently low density zoned, PC29 is inequitable in that it imposes a relatively higher cost and amenity loss compared with, for example, general residential zoned areas. - The uptake of future apartment development will be uneven, ad-hoc with the effects potentially localised and/or concentrated. - 19.5 metres is a wholly inappropriate and unnecessary height limit for Nelson City. While structural engineers can design a 6-level building to an appropriate level of strength, such construction is more expensive. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S555.012	Gerrard Wilson	Mapping	Amend	That the proposed rezoning of the site at 239 Rutherford Street to High Density Residential be amended to be General Residential zone.	Refer to reasons in submission points S555.001 and S555.011.	Reject	*Section 6*

S560.004	Jane Bayley	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Reduce the maximum building height in REr19.J to 10m with no roof pitch averaging and anything higher being a Discretionary Activity [in the High Density Residential Zone].	Oppose the increase to permitted building height from 7.5m to 19.5m. Council have identified a number of areas within Flood zones, Fault hazard zones and around the Cathedral (former Pa site) which they consider appropriate for high density and increased up to 6 storey units. I do not support the increase of dwelling heights in the High Density Zone to 6 storeys but consider that this should be limited to 3 storeys, as per my submission on REr18.J with a max permitted building height of 10m. Density is able to be dealt with by way of number of units, not height. Limit maximum building height to 10m.	Reject	*Section 6*
S560.007	Jane Bayley	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Amend] REr.19.K and reduce the daylight recession plane to 45 degrees starting at 4m.	Sunshine hours within a property is considered in NZ to be a common right. Around NZ this has historically be achieved through using adjustable angles based on the property boundary positions. The proposal removes this and is creating a higher angle (60 degrees starting a 12m) does not take into the effects of the suns pattern. Council is failing its community by reducing daylight protection in a city which prides itself and markets itself on being the sunshine capital. Seek to replace with starting at 4m and a 45 degree angle.	Reject	*Section 6*
S560.022	Jane Bayley	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Amend REr.19B to enable up to six residential units on a site as a permitted activity within the high density residential zone, provided one on site carpark is provided per unit [as per submission point 10], and one loading bay [per	Refer to reasons in submission point S560.011.	Reject	*Section 6*

S561.003	Kirsten Brown	Mapping	Oppose in part	[Reduce the extent of the] high-density residential zone. It need not extend south of Bronte Street, nor is it appropriate for the area bounded by Franklyn Street and Locking Terrace, or in Nelson South between Motueka and Tukuka Streets. The medium density residential zone is more appropriate for these areas.	In general, I am supportive of increased residential density in Nelson. A reasonable increase in residential density in the city centre and city fringe area would improve its vibrancy - something the city centre is currently very much lacking. It would also serve to limit sprawl, preserve rural land, and provide a wider variety of housing choices (something that is also currently lacking). I believe these are all worthy objectives. If the high-density residential zone extends too far outside of the city centre, Nelson risks losing its "heart" even more so than it is already struggling to maintain it. Classifying these areas as high-density residential would counter the objective of making the Nelson CBD the "compact and vibrant centre" desired by DO14.2. I urge Council to retain more discretion over high-density development proposals in these areas.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S561.004	Kirsten Brown	Residential Zones	Amend	[Amend] REr.19K - [to improve] Daylight access in the high-density residential zone by reducing the 23.5m distance from the road boundary in REr.19K.1. a. i. and; requiring a daylight / sunlight assessment for certain sites where new development would have significant negative impacts on the daylight access to neighbouring properties. The requirements for such an assessment could be triggered by slope and / or aspect to ensure all dwellings receive an adequate amount of winter sun.	Nelsonians place a huge amount of value on daylight and sun; this is what the city is known for, and why many people relocate here. The proposed plan change does not reflect these values. Daylight admission rules in the high-density residential zone run the risk of not permitting sufficient daylight. First-floor apartments in new developments will not receive adequate daylight in some settings and neither would existing neighbouring single or two-storey dwellings. The 23.5m distance from the road frontage for building envelopes could feasibly be reduced. Alternatively, and perhaps preferably, a daylight / sunlight assessment could be a requirement for certain sites where new development would have significant negative impacts on the daylight access to neighbouring properties. The requirements for such an assessment could be triggered by slope and / or aspect to ensure all dwellings receive an adequate amount of winter sun. I will add to this by stating that I have happily lived in apartment buildings overseas where daylight access was very limited. However, I cannot emphasise enough that the standard of these apartments in which I lived were far better with respect to insulation, glazing, central heating / cooling, and soundproofing. While I have been in countless warm, dry, quiet, and pleasant apartments and townhouses overseas, I have yet to see any that are built to the same standard here. Homes in New Zealand, even new builds in Nelson, depend on sunlight to keep them warm, dry, and free of mould.	Reject	*Section 6*

S562.003	Hugh Short	Residential Zones	Oppose	Amend the proposed residential zones to two zones (one High Density Zone and the other General Residential Zone) i.e. a much smaller area for higher density residential construction centred in the current Inner City Centre and City Fringe areas,	We wish to live in an attractive and spatially well designed City which reflects and protects its heritage and is consistent with the objectives and policies of the current NRMP for our site. Council's consideration of current resource consents applications in the Lower Density Area review the potential for adverse visual and physical dominance effects. That which is proposed by Plan Change 29 will have substantial visual and physical dominance effects and not retain the streetscape and residential amenity of the wider environment. Plan Change 29 is not consistent with the objectives and policies [refer to in point 4. 'Visual and dominance effects' in the original submission for more detail] which have over time led to the development of Nelson as we know it today, as a City with its unique and highly valued character, a place that current residents enjoy and future residents will value.	Reject	*Section 6*
S567.011	Mary Short	Residential Zones	Oppose	Any applications for more intensivedevelopment should be publicly notified to affected neighbors and in someinstances to the wider public.	We consider that if the proposed High Density Zoning is confirmed it would enable a large development capacity as of right. One of the Council's core responsibilities is to manage infrastructure capability to enable development within their district while protecting the unique character, environment and amenity for both current and future residents and not enabling third parties to make these decisions.	Reject	*Section 6*

S573.003	David Allan	Residential Zones	Amend	Provide fit for purpose setback requirements in the HDZ daylight rules to ensure direct sunlight to ground level is protected for liveable and attractive streets.	I support High Density zones in principle to enable intensification. High sunlight climate is a key reason many people live in Nelson. My reading of the curent sunlight provisions are not fit-for-purpose (with a 60 degree sunlight angle) for ensuring an attractive and people friendly streets in HDZ and particularly in the CBD. I suggest rules are strengthened to ensure at winter solstice provide direct sunlight to ground level of building frontages and footpaths (excluding north side of east west streets). This will require setbacks for development of buildings to the full height allowed of 19.5m. It will also present opportunities for elevated outdoor terrace type spaces, especially on east and west street frontages of developments. This will ensure the attractive character of the CBD as a sunny low scale streetscape. This will contribute to the CBD revitalisation currently being proposed as the streets would remain attractive people spaces. In addition, outdoor seating for commercial hospitality and public spaces could then optimise the sunny space.	Reject	*Section 6*

S575.001	Andrew Marriott	Residential Zones	Oppose	The proposed High Density Zone not to be applied to any Residential Property.	The scope of what Council is looking to by intensification under PC29 is to broad, without enough controls balancing current resident enjoyment with future resident enjoyment/ housing needs. Council is moving too far, too fast without proposer consideration. The results of 6 story buildings pepper-potted into existing low-rise residential suburbs will blight Nelson's urban development visually and spatially for generations. I support intensification but not like this. In its FDS, Council acknowledges it cannot overly influence affordability. Yet the Introduction to PC29 indicates that this has perhaps significantly influenced Council's decision making (I refer to the Context section 4.1 at page 21). The supporting evidence around PC29 conflates affordability and supply. Nelson may have an affordability issue but at least in the short- medium term Council's own reports do not show a shortage of capacity near to the extent PC29 enables. Council's consultation to date has been almost exclusively with government agencies and developers. So the Council has put forward a planning solution which aims at new buildings on land - as opposed to repurposing of existing buildings in city and city fringe, or developments of those sites. It should consider alternative methods of intensification appropriate to our region before instituting planning rules which significantly change amenity values for many residents. If Council wishes to deal with housing affordability, and it wishes to use planning tools to do so, I suggest it would be better to require developers to say, include "inclusionary zones" in all larger developments, where the developer is required to include a certain number of affordable homes. Not "efficient and effective"- no information available to the public on this PC29 does not adequately provide for what a Nelson "well functioning urban environment" (in implementing the Urban Development NPS) would be. The section 32 report justifies that PC29 is the "efficient and effective" option (eg p 132, table 25	Reject	*Section 6*
S580.015	Small Time Developments	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Oppose 35m2 minimum size residential unit restriction in the High Density Residential zone [REr 19U]	Refer to reasons in submission point S580.014.	Reject	*Section 6*
S581.013	Hilary Kirby	Residential Zones	Oppose	If the Plan Change and High Density Residential zone is not rejected, include a maximum height of 7.5m (current) for central Stoke for the areas proposed to be High	Refer to the reasons in submission point S581.002.	Reject	*Section 6*

S581.014	Hilary Kirby	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	If the Plan Change and High Density Residential zone is not rejected, retain all recession planes (and comyfencement height and degree angle of the same) as detailed in	Refer to reasons in submission point S581.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
S581.015	Hilary Kirby	Residential Zones	Oppose	If the Plan Change and High Density Residential zone is not rejected, amend the provisions to ensure that any non-compliance with Rules REr.18J or REr.19J (both as to height), and/or REr.18K or REr.19K (both as to daylight admission) be considered as "non-	Refer to reasons in submission point S581.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
S587.006	Change PC 29 Incorporated	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend the High Density Residential Zone to ensure that any non-compliance with Rules REr.19J (as to height), and/or REr.19K (as to daylight admission) be considered as "non-complying" - and not as Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary activity, if the	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S587.010	Change PC 29 Incorporated	Residential Zones	Oppose	Request amendment to ensure that, if at least one car park is not provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be zoned HDZ or MDZ; any failure to comply strictly with all other Rules in Rules REr.18 or REr.19 set out in the PC 29 will mean that the proposal is to be considered as "non-complying", if the Plan Change is to proceed in any form.	The prospective loss in value that properties in the proposed HDZ will suffer if/when a six storey apartment block (with no on-site parking provision) is built (as of right - with no opportunity for neighbourhood input) 1 metre from the boundary. The loss of amenity (and future traffic hazard) to the area in the general vicinity of such a building: caused by vehicular traffic trying to find carparks.	Reject	*Section 6*
S589.018	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend REr.19l Fences as follows: A fence is a permitted activity provided that:...*x. it does not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut off valves, or other emergency response facilities.*	Fire and Emergency support REr.19l insofar as (a) requires fencing to not block access to any parking or manoeuvring space. It is important to Fire and Emergency that the erection of fences and walls will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut off valves, or other emergency response facilities. Fences and walls should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for Fire and Emergency. As such, Fire and Emergency seeks an amendment to provide for this.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS68.007	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Amend REr.19l Fences as follows: A fence is a permitted activity provided that: .... x. it does not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut off valves, or other emergency response facilities. The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in this plan change.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS69.011	Ryman Healthcare Limited		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Amend REr.19l Fences as follows: A fence is a permitted activity provided that: .... x. it does not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut off valves, or other emergency response facilities. Ryman opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in this plan change.	Reject	*Section 6*
S589.036	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Residential Zones	Neutral	Further clarification needed as to the application of REr.19B.1 and REr.19B3, and the relevance of assessment criteria to each activity status.	Fire and Emergency support REr.19B providing the assessment criteria listed in REr.19B.4 is applicable to all activity types under this rule. If the assessment criteria is not applied to all activity types under REr.19B, there is a risk that when developing up to three residential units on a site, emergency service access and firefighting water supply matters will not be appropriately provided for.	Reject	*Section 6*

S589.037	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Residential Zones	Support	Further clarification needed as to the application of the assessment criteria in REr.19B.4 to each activity type under rule REr.19B.	Fire and Emergency strongly support the inclusion of the following matters within the assessment criteria: • whether the development can be adequately serviced for firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of Practice. • whether access for emergency service vehicles is appropriately designed so that staff can access the site safely and efficiently. However, it is unclear when the assessment criteria is applied and clarification regarding this is required.	Reject	*Section 6*
S591.002	Kent Inglis	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Remove Daylight provisions in relation to properties to the North.	I don't believe that you should have to address setbacks from buildings to the north where there is no sunlight/daylight impact as this is captured by other rules such as 'overlooking'; the minimum setback required for fire protection also helps control setback from boundary. If an existing neighboring building is breaching planning or setback rules, I don't believe you should have to give effect to that breach.	Reject	*Section 6*

S591.005	Kent Inglis	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Amend' Rule REr.19K.1(a)(i) [to clarify the application of the rule in relation to lots without a road boundary inferred].	Proposed HRZ daylight angle requirements are for 12m + 60° angle within first 23.5m from road boundary (22m building length + 1.5m road boundary setback); 4m + 60° angle after 23.5m from road boundary. For lots without a road boundary, this requirement may have unintended consequences. I understand that the principle if to avoid 'long' unbroken development, but I believe there is also a rule restricting building length to 22m. There are other rules in place around unbroken facades that could be better used to address this. This could potentially lead to issues with a patchwork of building heights within areas, potentially also exacerbating issues around daylight provisions. For example, imagine two lots running north to south with a northern road boundary. The lot to the north can build - 12m + 60° angle within first 23.5m, the lot to the south 4m + 60°. The lot to the south will be hugely compromised by a higher building to the north.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S591.011	Kent Inglis	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Amend Rules HCr.35 and REr.19K.1(a)(i) [to clarify the application of the rule in relation to lots without a road boundary inferred]	Refer to reasons in submission points S591.002 and S591.005.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S593.002	Marcus Dadds	Mapping	Oppose	For the council to change the boundaries of the High Density Residential Zone and for the Plan Change 29 to be more focused on quality rather than quantity and growth.	The inner city area is currently suffering from a lack of businesses investment (shops, bars, entertainment). By bringing the high density residential zone into the inner city may provide for a local population to support and lift the inner city areas as shops etc within walking distance. The integrity of the "colonial style" buildings that surround the center (and are now being proposed in Change 29) could be preserved if this zoning change takes place.	Reject	*Section 6*

S596.002	Jennifer-Anne Fletcher	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Reject] the High Density Residential zone in residential areas, particularly for south side east Nile Street and surrounding residential areas.	Refer to the reasons in S613.001 and the following: - The HDRZ will increase population into a relatively small area and will put significant pressure on infrastructure and resources in those areas. - There is reliance on already existing landscape such as parks and green-spaces such as the church hill to provide landscape to these buildings and those resources are not limitless in their capacity to absorb the pressure of these buildings and population. - This new zone does not guarantee a vibrant city centre and neighbourhood so can be no justification for the zoning. - It is inappropriate for the council to classify an area HDRZ based on closeness / walk-in distance to the inner city. - The HDRZ will have a negative effect on and unduly compromise privacy and amenity of existing residences in the areas sought to have it imposed upon that have mainly low level one and two storey homes on. - The existing residential zones allow sufficient flexibility for building of multi-level buildings - notification is needed and consent needed to ensure control over such buildings. - Too much pressure is being placed by HDRZ on a small area of Nelson. - I consider that the existing higher buildings on the north side of Nile Street (e.g. Bett Building/ Pitt and Moore building) are where the medium density should start rising toward the inner city /CBD. Nile street itself provides a sensible boundary and space for increased heights of buildings, differing styles and use. - It is not increased buildings and higher buildings that will bring about a more vibrant and livable city and encourage people to come into the city rather it is the beautification and retention of the character of the city that will draw people.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S597.005	Stephanie Phillips	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Oppose the 19.5m maximum building height for the High Density Residential Zone [inferred].	Amplification of height. Due to the ground topography in Nelson a large portion of the high density and medium zone adjoin general residential zones. But the effect on adjacent properties would be even more severe. 19.5m building - 3- 6m higher would cast an even longer shadow. Across multiple properties.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S601.008	Julie Strange	Residential Zones	Oppose	Amend high density zone building height rules to be lower than 6 storeys and require car parks for all new residences [inferred].	6 storied residences are not appropriate for Nelson at all make them smaller and car parks for all. I have lived in Melbourne and workd as a district nurse. High rises there become appauling ghettos, sadly smelling of urine in the corridors, freqeunt visit from police and me as visiting District Nurse having to engage the use of a security guard to enter the building. It would be sad for Nelson to become like this.	Reject	*Section 6*
S603.003	SPArchitect Ltd	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Remove High Density Residential Zone.	Medium and High density zones - will destroy existing amenity and built character of the city that is a key feature of the city. The objectives of more development and residents both in the city and within existing residential zones can occur with a more careful and considered approach that does not destroy the amenity for existing residents and built form that is the city character. 3-6 storey buildings destroy amenity to existing 1-2 storey residences. Loss of Privacy - the sense of being watched or observed. Buildings of differing scales overlook and over shadow smaller homes.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S603.006	SPArchitect Ltd	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Oppose the 19.5m maximum building height for the High Density Residential Zone [inferred].	Amplification of height. Due to the ground topography in Nelson a large portion of the high density and medium zone adjoin general residential zones. But the effect on adjacent properties would be even more severe. 19.5m building - 3- 6m higher would cast an even longer shadow. Across multiple properties.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S605.001	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Mapping	Oppose	[Rezone the] area [bound by Waimea Road, Hampden Street, Bronte Street, and Collingwood Street to] General Residential (as opposed to mixture of High Density and Medium Density). Alternatively, this area is to be subject to Character Area Overlay requiring detailed consideration of built form in exceedance of specific General Residential performance standards.	[The area within the bounds of Waimea Road, Hampden Street, Bronte Street, and Collingwood Street] holds special characteristics that warrant protection. We note that the area is both within the Grampians Landscape Area (AP9.4) and is identified as having views of critical importance to the district (Table 9.1: Significant Views). Development should only proceed following detailed assessment of the potential impacts on these values. The area deliberately includes some General Residential areas, where they hold values that may contribute to the Character Area Overlay. [Refer to map provided in the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS64.001	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety. The decision I seek is that the submission is accepted but that the specific area defined in that submission at Submission Table A (the Character Area) is extended to that area on both sides of Collingwood Street between Bronte Street and Manuka Street currently zoned low density residential (the Collingwood Street Area). The reason for my support is that I agree the area has special characteristics that have not been considered sufficiently as a part of the plan change; and the reason I seek extension of the Character Area to the Collingwood Street Area is it is contiguous with the Character Area in submission 605 and it too has special characteristics that warrant protection. Further I note that would be consistent with the treatment of neighbourhood N20-Fairfield Park in regard to Collingwood Street from Manuka Street north - as has been used by Nelson City Council in its availability and proposed neighbourhood panning.	Reject	*Section 6*

S605.026	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend] DO18.1.1V High Density Zone [as follows]: The primary goal of the High Density Residential Zone is to provide the opportunity for high density housing in close walking distance to commercial services and community facilities. The zone enables a range of housing types, with a focus on more intensive forms of housing, including terraces and apartments at a variety of scales. The zone achieves a high-density residential character by generally enabling residential buildings up to six storeys and requiring on site landscaped areas and private open space suitable to the housing types enabled. High density residential development is more intensive than typical low density areas and will result in a high degree of visual change to neighbourhoods. The degree of visual change, particularly within Character Area, will be managed through resource consent process. Subject to assessment through the resource consent	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS64.027	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.037	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend] RE1.0.1 [as follows]: The zone enables a range of housing types, with a focus on more intensive forms of housing, including terraces and apartments at a variety of scales. The zone achieves a high density residential character by generally enabling residential buildings up to six storeys and requiring on site landscaped areas and private open space suitable to the housing types enabled. High density residential development is more intensive than typical density areas and will result in a high degree of visual change to neighbourhoods. The degree of visual change, particularly within Character Areas, will be managed through resource consent process. The Zone expects	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS64.038	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*
S605.046	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Mapping	Oppose	[Rezone] all [notified PC29] High Density [areas to] General Residential.	This submission opposes REr19A-19V in their entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS64.047	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*
S606.002	David Ayre	Mapping	Amend	Rethink or amend the Plan Change to undertake design-led change at the community level, one area at a time, led by an Urban Design Authority or similar body, replacing the current proposal for broad brush rezoning into medium and high density intensification.	I support the general intention of Plan Change 29 to intensify Nelson. I strongly disagree with the way that PC29 has approached doing this, and as a result I wish to have PC29 rethought or heavily amended... PC29 is trying to make sweeping broad-brush changes that will radically change the nature of the city, at speed, and doing it in a way that would leave the city in the hands of individual land owners and the developers working with them. This creates random threats from nearby development for people living here from now onwards, harming them, and the wider community... To correct these aspects of PC29 as we work to make Nelson a better place in the future, there are many things in PC29 that need amending. The central one is a need for design-led change at the community level, one area at a time, led by an Urban Design Authority or similar body. This completely replaces the current proposal for broad brush rezoning into medium and high density intensification.	Reject	*Section 6*

S607.002	Belinda Fletcher	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Reject] the High Density Residential zone in residential areas, particularly for south side east Nile Street and surrounding residential areas.	Refer to the reasons in S613.001 and the following: - The HDRZ will increase population into a relatively small area and will put significant pressure on infrastructure and resources in those areas. - There is reliance on already existing landscape such as parks and green-spaces such as the church hill to provide landscape to these buildings and those resources are not limitless in their capacity to absorb the pressure of these buildings and population. - This new zone does not guarantee a vibrant city centre and neighbourhood so can be no justification for the zoning. - It is inappropriate for the council to classify an area HDRZ based on closeness / walk-in distance to the inner city. - The HDRZ will have a negative effect on and unduly compromise privacy and amenity of existing residences in the areas sought to have it imposed upon that have mainly low level one and two storey homes on. - The existing residential zones allow sufficient flexibility for building of multi-level buildings - notification is needed and consent needed to ensure control over such buildings. - Too much pressure is being placed by HDRZ on a small area of Nelson. - I consider that the existing higher buildings on the north side of Nile Street (e.g. Bett Building/ Pitt and Moore building) are where the medium density should start rising toward the inner city /CBD. Nile street itself provides a sensible boundary and space for increased heights of buildings, differing styles and use.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S608.006	Nelsust Inc. - Peter Olorenshaw	Residential Zones	Amend	Reduce maximum permitted building height to 3 stories (11m high) in the High Density Residential Zone.	The height proposals are surprisingly high, one of the 2 most contentious things in the proposed changes. We think they are unnecessarily high in allowing 6 storeys as of right in high density areas and 4 storeys in medium density areas. While this height might be something we head to in the future, it is a significant shock to a provincial city like Nelson where most houses are only single storey, only a few 2 storey. We ask you to change this to 3 storeys as of right (11m) (with other changes to recession planes - see below) in the high density areas and 2 storeys in the medium (8m). To go higher you should have to apply for a resource consent where things like neighbourhood effects can be taken into account.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S608.018	Nelsust Inc. - Peter Olorenshaw	Residential Zones	Amend	Change the recession planes in the High Density Residential Zones to allow higher recession planes [5m and 45 degrees] on southern oriented boundaries where the neighbouring property has built a party wall on	Refer to reasons in submission point S608.09 and the original submission for more detail.	Reject	*Section 6*

S613.002	Jason McCormick	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Reject] the High Density Residential zone in residential areas, particularly for south side east Nile Street and surrounding residential areas.	Refer to the reasons in S613.001 and the following: - The HDRZ will increase population into a relatively small area and will put significant pressure on infrastructure and resources in those areas. - There is reliance on already existing landscape such as parks and green-spaces such as the church hill to provide landscape to these buildings and those resources are not limitless in their capacity to absorb the pressure of these buildings and population. - This new zone does not guarantee a vibrant city centre and neighbourhood so can be no justification for the zoning. - It is inappropriate for the council to classify an area HDRZ based on closeness / walk-in distance to the inner city. - The HDRZ will have a negative effect on and unduly compromise privacy and amenity of existing residences in the areas sought to have it imposed upon that have mainly low level one and two storey homes on. - The existing residential zones allow sufficient flexibility for building of multi-level buildings - notification is needed and consent needed to ensure control over such buildings. - Too much pressure is being placed by HDRZ on a small area of Nelson. - I consider that the existing higher buildings on the north side of Nile Street (e.g. Bett Building/ Pitt and Moore building) are where the medium density should start rising toward the inner city /CBD. Nile street itself provides a sensible boundary and space for increased heights of buildings, differing styles and use.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S614.004	Redbox Architects 2017 Ltd	Residential Zones	Amend	Include some qualitative parameters in the high density residential zone.	[Because of] the proposed setback, height and daylight rules proposed.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S614.007	Redbox Architects 2017 Ltd	Residential Zones	Amend	Require controls over visual privacy in the high density residential zone.	Refer to reasons in submission point S614.006.	Reject	*Section 6*

S621.002	Paula Holden	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Reduce the maximum building heights [in the Residential High Density Zone].	The proposed height of 6 storeys as of right is too high - this is likely to change the character of Nelson to the detriment of it's community with sun & privacy particularly effected.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S623.013	Alistair Kwan	Residential Zones	Oppose	Protect for some long-range view, e.g. Guarantee some solid angle measure of view to and above the horizon from the main living spaces of existing buildings.	Open views of natural space are important both out of a building, and also onto a building. Views provide not simply for simple niceness, but for mental health. Many houses along Locking Street, For example, get views only to the Grampians and, if you look directly up, into the sky. Inconsiderately erecting a tall building at the West End of examiner street may cut those residents off entirely.	Reject	*Section 6*
S625.010	Resilienz Ltd Lindsay Wood	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend the maximum permitted building height in the High Density Residential Zone to 15m for timber lower floor; and 14.4m for concrete ground floor construction.	We consider that the maximum height as of right in the HRZ should be 15m with a timber lower floor, being a ground floor at 1.5 m above ground level, 4 floors at 3 m floor to floor, and additional 1.5 m for roof construction. This is a versatile height that allows five storeys including a half-basement, is not necessarily serviced by a lift, and is in greater keeping with streetscapes, treescapes and the like... There are numerous benefits to developing medium-density residential developments with a utility basement excavated half a storey into the ground... Given that such high levels of intensification are not required to accommodate the forecast population growth we consider a lower maximum height should be adopted for the HRZ... Refer to reasons in submission point S625.009 and the original submission for more detail.	Reject	*Section 6*

S629.002	Samuel Nevin	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend the restrictive standard that there can only be up to 3 residential units on a high density residential zone. I seek that the limit be raised to a high number as considered appropriate by the Council (perhaps 9).	It is unclear to me why there is a restriction of 3 unit in the high density zone. Given a new development is permitted to be up to 6 storeys high, it is reasonable to anticipate that many such developments will provide more than 3 units. The only mention or rationale I could find for this from a quick skim of the s32 report was on page 143 that four or more units would "enable a qualitative design assessment for a multi unit development". If thats the case, then the basis to trigger a qualitative assessment (via consent) should be based on building size/bulk, not the number of units. Otherwise, there would be a situation, for example, where one 6 storey building with 3 units does not require consent whilst another 6 storey building with 4 plus units does. Space will need to be provided for bike parking, rubbish storage and loading zone for larger multi unit developments - all of which can have specified standards.	Reject	*Section 6*
S629.003	Samuel Nevin	Residential Zones	Amend	[Request] new residential units on the first floor and higher should not require any outdoor space provided they are within approximately 500 metres of green space/parks etc.	The standard [REr.] 19F that requires all units in a new development to have some form of outdoor space is perhaps too onerous given the likely form and nature of the developments in the high density zone. These may be apartments on the city centre fringe or other built up areas, and the provision of balconies etc is not always necessary for those wanting a 'city centre' urban life. Suggest this requirement is removed. Nearby green spaces can provide sufficient outdoor space for people inhabiting these apartments.	Reject	*Section 6*

S631.003	Shea Gillison	Residential Zones	Support in part	Refine and reduce the extent of the Medium and High Density Residential Zones through the implementation of neighbourhood plans specifically designed for these zones.	I firmly believe that the current extent of the Medium and High Density Zones is too broad and needs a more refined approach. The onesize-fits-all zoning currently in place may not adequately consider the unique characteristics and needs of each neighborhood within our city. To address this concern, I recommend the implementation of localized neighborhood plans.	Reject	*Section 6*
S638.001	Vernon Patterson and Diana Russell	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the proposal to allow high density (up to 6 stories) in urban residential areas, specifically Stoke and [seeks council] remove the provision to allow for up to 6 storeys in Stoke.	We live in Neale Avenue and own two single level homes (one rented to a young family) on a subdivided section. We have engaged in housing intensification in the way we feel is most appropriate for the Stoke suburb; sub-dividing a medium size section and building one further family-sized residence on the new lot. This has maintained access to green space and sunlight, two amenities essential to human wellbeing. We face the possibility of a six storey development directly across our narrow street and the subsequent loss of enjoyment of our suburban environment and lifestyle and the value of our properties being compromised. Our neighbourhood is one where residents know and look after each other and where young families feel safe. We know and support each other and our children attend local schools and play together. We came to this area for the very values that currently exist. The Stoke area identified for high density housing is one of largely well-maintained family houses which are many years, perhaps a generation or two, from the end of their economic life and far from ready for demolition and redevelopment.	Reject	*Section 6*

S640.002	Susan Smallcombe	Residential Zones	Oppose	Lower building height so as not to block sunlight.	I am giving my concerns for the 6-story buildings. I live at Sussex mews. These are single story and two-story buildings. Suddenly a four-story building gets built with no consultation with neighbors. It is too high. At the house nearest has changed hands 3 times as they lose their sun at about 3.30 (before it was 6.30) no light/sunlight studies were done.	Reject	*Section 6*
S644.001	Brian Muldoon	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	I request that the proposed building be no higher than 2 storeys high, as presently allowed by the rules. If the building of a block of flats goes ahead that it be no higher than 3 storeys high.	6 storeys will block out the sun for surrounding properties for up to 25 metres. The average garden is only 18 metres long. This is a negative environmental factor for properties surrounding the proposed 6 storey building.	Reject	*Section 6*
S644.002	Brian Muldoon	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[If the decision requested in submission point S644.001 is refused] Alternatiely build a 6 storey building in another location of Nelson, where it does not affect local residents negatively, environmentally.	A 6 storey building will cause overcrowding in what is a small area around that part of Examiner Street. It is a very busy area during the week because of visitors to surrounding businesses. Overcrowing will only add to that. On the weekend the area is quieter and the locals deserve to have this quiet enjoyment preserved, and not subject to inensification.	Reject	*Section 6*

S647.001	Christopher Fitchett	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Request] that the maximum height in the HRZ be reduced from 19.5 metres, (six storeys), to 12 metres, (3 storeys), but that buildings over 8 metres require a publicly notified resource consent so that the effect on neighbouring properties can be taken into account.	I am more concerned for the future of the whole of the Nelson residential area. The proposed changes would alter the whole feel of the residential area of Nelson with six storey buildings scattered at random throughout the area. It is quite detrimental that Council plans to allow six storey buildings in residential areas. In the past there have been strict planning rules that gave the neighbours reasonable protection of sunlight, views and privacy, and also gave protection to the general public. Plan 29 completely reverses all these rules and allows a developer to block the sunlight, views, and take away privacy. If the proposal is adopted, it would result in many houses not seeing any sunlight during winter months. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S648.002	Clayton Munting	Residential Zones	Amend	Reduce the High density residential zone (HRZ) height limit from 6 storeys down to 4 storeys.	I feel the proposed 19.5m (6 storey) height limit is too high in this zone, given the shading such development would cause to surrounding property's and suggest a 4 storey height limit.	Reject	*Section 6*
S650.001	Torlesse Trustees Limited for Dunstan Family Trust	Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove the High Density Zoning from 4 Brookside.	The proposed High Density Zoning will lead to a substantial and adverse change to the character and amenity of the environment within which 4 Brookside is located. The combined set of provisions that are proposed to provide for intensification within the High Density Zone are considered to be inappropriate for this part of this residential zone.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S650.003	Torlesse Trustees Limited for Dunstan Family Trust	Residential Zones	Oppose	Delete REr.19B [Residential units] and retain the existing Residential Building Rules allowing a building height of up to7.5metres in height.	It is considered that this rule, combined with the other High Density provisions making up PC29, will lead to a substantial and adverse change to the residential environment around 4 Brookside.	Reject	*Section 6*

S650.004	Torlesse Trustees Limited for Dunstan Family Trust	Residential Zones	Oppose	Delete REr.19C [Site coverage] and retain the existing Residential Building Rules allowing a building height of up to7.5 metres in height.	It is considered that this rule, combined with the other High Density provisions making up PC29, will lead to a substantial and adverse change to the residential environment around 4 Brookside.	Reject	*Section 6*
S650.005	Torlesse Trustees Limited for Dunstan Family Trust	Residential Zones	Oppose	Delete REr.19E [Other yards] and retain the existing Residential Building Rules allowing a building height of up to 7.5 metres in height.	It is considered that this rule, combined with the other High Density provisions making up PC29, will lead to a substantial and adverse change to the residential environment around 4 Brookside.	Reject	*Section 6*
S650.006	Torlesse Trustees Limited for Dunstan Family Trust	Residential Zones	Oppose	Delete REr.19J [Maximum building height] and retain the existing Residential Building Rules allowing a building height of up to 7.5 metres in height.	It is considered that this rule, combined with the other High Density provisions making up PC29, will lead to a substantial and adverse change to the residential environment around 4 Brookside.	Reject	*Section 6*
S650.007	Torlesse Trustees Limited for Dunstan Family Trust	Residential Zones	Oppose	Delete REr.19S [Maximum building length] and retain the existing Residential Building Rules allowing a building height of up to 7.5 metres in height.	It is considered that this rule, combined with the other High Density provisions making up PC29, will lead to a substantial and adverse change to the residential environment around 4 Brookside.	Reject	*Section 6*
S650.008	Torlesse Trustees Limited for Dunstan Family Trust	Residential Zones	Oppose	Delete REr.19U [Residential unit - minimum size] and retain the existing Residential Building Rules allowing a building height of up to 7.5 metres in height.	In conjunction with other parts of PC29, the environment surrounding MSHL is proposed to significantly change as a part of the intensification objectives.	Reject	*Section 6*
S650.009	Torlesse Trustees Limited for Dunstan Family Trust	Residential Zones	Oppose	Delete REr.19K [Daylight Admission] and retain the existing Residential Building Rules allowing a building height of up to 7.5metres in height.	This new rule will substantially change the daylight amenity received on residential sites in the High Density Zone. Combined with the other High Density provisions making up PC29, will lead to a substantial and adverse change to the residential environment around 4 Brookside.	Reject	*Section 6*
S652.004	Graeme Tyree	Residential Zones	Amend	Regarding the proposed maximum height of six storeys, I suggest making it four storeys "as of right" with resource consent required for five or six storeys, taking neighbourhood effects into	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

S694.008	Glenys MacLellan	Residential Zones	Amend	Restrict building heights and form in the HDZ to 3 storey terrace style housing with rules as follows: Buildings are not to shade out neighbours, especially to the south by more than an area consistent existing house would. They must never cast shade over existing PV or solar hot water systems. They must be light colours. All such developments need neighbourhood consultation and consent to ensure it complies with the neighbourhood plan. Plan changes are not permitted except under a full consultation process. Accessible design is essential and cheaper to build in than refurbish so should be mandatory. Passive solar design should be the norm. A communal area with trees should be included either as gardens, park, or just a pleasant number of units.	I do not think [4-5 storey buildings] are appropriate for the proposed High Density Zone because we do not have the population to support such scale over the HDZ area and hopefully never will. Large dark coloured buildings can be very oppressive and overpowering to many people, not to mention depressive. Full glass cladding can cause reflective issues and so is not appropriate. I am reminded of the unintended outcomes in the UK when Councils there started pulling down the old, terraced housing and replacing them with high-rises (much higher than proposed here of course). It destroyed the local communities that these streets had always had, and alienation began appearing along with social isolation for the less mobile and more residents began to fear for their safety after dark. Buildings do not have to be very high for this to happen; it's all about the design. This is not the result we want or need in Nelson.	Reject	*Section 6*
S696.002	John Munting	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Limit construction in the residential zones to 3 stories.	The Nelson City Council proposal for potential six-storey residential buildings in an area which is predominantly single story as totally unacceptable. Remember that Nelson is trending as a retirement area and single story accommodation is preferable for them. Three stories are a better fit in with existing buildings.	Reject	*Section 6*
S698.003	Margaret Muir	Residential Zones	Oppose	Maximum building heights to be three storeys.	With regard to submission point S698.003. I also oppose the proposal to build tower blocks up to six stories high. This is too high even for any new subdivisions and the City Centre. I have seen first-hand the ongoing effects of such tower blocks in the UK, which rapidly deteriorate and becomes slums. Three stories as the absolute maximum that should be permitted.	Reject	*Section 6*

S700.010	Susan Hamilton	Mapping	Oppose	Manage development in the City by amending the proposed residential zones to two zones (one High Density Zone and the other General Residential Zone) i.e. a much smaller area for higher density construction centred in the current Inner City Centre and City Fringe areas with the remainder of the City remaining with the NRMP current objectives and policies and allow for 3 units intensification up to to two storeys on some adequately sized sites. Provide for specific sites throughout the City where effects can be mitigated and where higher buildings can be accommodated and developed following resource consent approval with the opportunity for any affected parties to make submissions.	Align management of intensification and densification of development using the Pareto Management Principle by looking for 20% of the area where 80% of the developments will occur. This leads to development being managed centrally within the current Inner City Zone and not covering a wide area of the proposed Medium and High Density Zones. This provides higher residential accommodation close to commercial activity and the Nelson Transport Hub. There will be some specific sites outside this Zone where the remaining 20% of development can occur. There will be specific sites throughout the City where effects can be mitigated and where higher buildings can be accommodated and developed following resource consent approval with the opportunity for any affected parties to make submissions. This is all about Council managing the development of the City (one of its core tasks), not passing the initiative to other parties, and therefore minimising unintended consequences. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*

S703.002	Mike Hawes	Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove the 6 storey maximum allowance as potentially ofright and adopt a Plan more along the lines of the Richmond proposal.	I oppose the potential to develop up to 6 storey apartment blocks in urban areas that are currently 1 to 2 storey design without neighbour consultation and resource consent requirements, In some areas it may be appropriate, e.g. the waterfront apartments where they are set back against a hillside and can actually visually benefit an area, but other areas, e.g. in the middle of a generally flat area of low-rise buildings, it seems inappropriate. Although this wouldn't automatically mean a flood of 6-storey high-rises appearing in our residential areas it would certainly open the door for that to occur. If we look at neighbouring Richmond, their proposed Richmond Spatial Intensification Plan allows for up to 4 storeys in the town centre with retail and office space on the ground floor and residential above, medium density apartments and townhouses up to 2-3 storeys around the edges of the town centre, and medium density townhouses up to 2 storeys in some urban areas. This appears to be a much more sensible option. Nelson runs the risk of becoming the less desirable area to live.	Reject	*Section 6*
S708.048	Harry Pearson	Residential Zones	Oppose	The inclusion in PC29 of a maximum height of 10 metres in the areas proposed to be HDZ.	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S708.050	Harry Pearson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to ensure that any non-compliance with Rules REr.19J (as to height) and/or REr.19K (as to daylight admissions) be considered as "non-complying" - and not as	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S708.052	Harry Pearson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to ensure that failure to comply strictly with all other Rules in Rules REr.19 set out in PC29 will make the proposal "non-complying"	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

S709.062	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend District wide explanation DO 15.1.1.iv [and associated Residential Zone explanation RE1.8.i] as follows: The primary goal of the High Density Residential Zone is to provide the opportunity for high density housing in close walking distance to commercial services and community facilities in conjunction with the provision of recreation reserves. The zone enables a range of housing types, with a focus on more intensive forms of housing, including terraces and apartments at a variety of scales. The zone achieves a high density residential character by generally enabling residential buildings up to [four] ~~six~~ storeys and requiring on site landscaped areas and private open space suitable to the housing types enabled. High density residential development is more intensive than typical low density areas and will result in a high degree of visual	Include "recreation reserves" in wording. Neighbourhood Parks help to break up the built environment, offer visual amenity and provide ecological and alternative transport corridors. They also have social and health benefits by acting as meeting and exercise places. [Refer to the original submission for more detail. Refer to submission point S709.062 for reasons related to the amendments included in this submission point regarding building height in the High Density Residential Zone]	Reject	*Section 6*

S709.063	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Enable buildings up to four storeys, where appropriate, in high density areas, and [make consequential amendments to the High Density Residential Zone provisions to give effect to this submission point].	NMPHS-NM has concerns relating to 6 stories and the impact it could have on public health and the wider determinants of health. As mentioned [in the original submission appendix A1], it is recommended that a SIA is undertaken to understand the implications of 6 stories and how it might affect individual and community wellbeing across all sectors of society. As recognised throughout this plan, factors relating to the urban environment, such as access to greenspace, active transport, services and resources; environmental factors such as noise, light, air quality; economic factors such as housing affordability; and social factors such as fear of crime, social capital, privacy levels, social interaction, networks and sense of belonging, are critical pieces to get right, to support wellbeing and healthy living environments in a high density residential area. It is important that people are 'taken on the journey' through urban intensification. NPHS-NM recommends enabling buildings up to four storeys, where appropriate, in high density areas and recommends a SIA is undertaken prior to enabling 6 storeys within this plan. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS56.101	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kainga Ora considers the rules and matters of discretion appropriately deal with amenity effects to provide for a sufficient standard of amenity to the extent that this it is consistent with the primary submission of Kāinga Ora. The assessment criteria REr.17B.4 (residential units) already references sunlight access in two places.	Accept	*Section 6*

S709.077	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend the High Density Residential Zone building height rule REr.17K.5 Assessment criteria, explanation as follows: The purpose of the building height rule, in combination with the other rules, is to achieve the planned residential character of the zone. Within this context, infringements to building height will be considered in terms of the whether character is achieved as a whole, while also considering effects on neighbouring sites, on-site and to the street and public open spaces. The impact of building height and how it affects the wellbeing of the local community is also a consideration. [and make consequential amendments to the	Refer to reasons in submission point S709.063.	Reject	*Section 6*
S710.003	Jenny Bennett and Aaron Thompson	Residential Zones	Support	Retain [High Density] zone description as provided in DO16.1.1.iv.	Appropriate area for development to support the social and economic outcomes of a diverse community, close to high quality education and green spaces/accessways. Refer to reasons in submission point S710.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S710.004	Jenny Bennett and Aaron Thompson	Residential Zones	Support	Retain Policy RE1.8 [High Density Residential Zones].	We acknowledge that this particular area of Toi Toi is appropriate for the nature of high-density housing, whereas in other areas a more site-specific approach is required. Refer to reasons in submission point S710.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S710.005	Jenny Bennett and Aaron Thompson	Residential Zones	Support	Retain rules REr.19B [Residential units].	Providing affordable housing options in an area with many close-knit families and cultural groups, allowing for connection and community. Many green spaces and parks/walkways to support community events and wellbeing.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS38.024	Small Time Developments		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: Providing affordable housing options in an area with many close-knit families and cultural groups, allowing for connection and community. Many green spaces and parks/walkways to support community events and wellbeing. Retain rules REr.19B [Residential units]. The 3 dwellings rule is a key one for opening opportunities for affordable housing.	Reject	*Section 6*

S710.006	Jenny Bennett and Aaron Thompson	Residential Zones	Support	Retain Rule REr.19J [Maximum building height].	Support for this area of St Vincent Street/Toi Toi due to the topography of the area and opportunity for terraced/staggered housing into the hill.	Reject	*Section 6*
S710.007	Jenny Bennett and Aaron Thompson	Residential Zones	Support	Retain Rule REr.19K [Daylight admission].	For the particular area of St Vincent Street/Toi Toi, this is appropriate. Refer to reasons in submission point S710.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S710.008	Jenny Bennett and Aaron Thompson	Residential Zones	Support	Retain Rule REr.19U [Residential unit - minimum size].	This standard is considered to provide a high degree of flexibility which will serve a diverse range of needs.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS38.025	Small Time Developments		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: This standard is considered to provide a high degree of flexibility which will serve a diverse range of needs. Retain Rule REr.19U [Residential unit - minimum size]. We believe that affordable and effective units can be provided with a smaller minimum size (especially when communal facilities are also provided). Ie <30m2 standalone or <20m2 with community facilities.	Accept	*Section 6*
S710.009	Jenny Bennett and Aaron Thompson	Mapping	Support	Retain High Density Zoning [at site at 136 St Vincent Street].	The site at 136 St Vincent Street is ideally suited to high density zoning due to its topography, proximity to schools, recreational amenity, cycleways, commercial activity and employment opportunities. Refer to reasons in submission point S710.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S712.002	Nicholas Fisher and Tammy Pegg	Mapping	Support	Retain [High Density] zoning [of the site at 31 Tpahi Street].	The site at 31 Tpahi Street is ideally suited to high density zoning due to its topography, proximity to schools, recreational amenity, cycleways, commercial activity and employment opportunities.	Reject	*Section 6*
S712.003	Nicholas Fisher and Tammy Pegg	Residential Zones	Support	Retain [DO16.1.1.iv: High Density Residential] zone description.	The [DO16.1.1.iv: High Density Residential] zone description is considered to be appropriate.	Reject	*Section 6*
S712.004	Nicholas Fisher and Tammy Pegg	Residential Zones	Support	Retain Policy RE1.8 [High Density Residential Zones].	This policy is considered to be appropriate.	Reject	*Section 6*
S712.005	Nicholas Fisher and Tammy Pegg	Residential Zones	Support	Rules REr.19B [Residential units].	This rule [REr.19B] is supported as it provides the opportunity for intensification in this part of Nelson South.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS38.026	Small Time Developments		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: This rule [REr.19B] is supported as it provides the opportunity for intensification in this part of Nelson South. The 3 dwellings rule is a key one for opening opportunities for affordable housing.	Reject	*Section 6*
S712.006	Nicholas Fisher and Tammy Pegg	Residential Zones	Support	Either: (a) Retain rule [REr.19J Maximum building height]; or (b) Reduce the height to a height if deemed more appropriate.	Increased building height is supported as it provides the opportunity for intensification in this part of Nelson South. A reduction to this proposal height would also achieve the intensification objective.	Reject	*Section 6*
S712.007	Nicholas Fisher and Tammy Pegg	Residential Zones	Support	Either: (a) Retain Rule REr.19K [Daylight admission]; or (b) Change REr.19K to apply the medium density (PC29) daylight admission standard.	As a part of increasing the building height it is also necessary to ensure the daylight admission parameters. Subject to what height is decided, it may also be appropriate to change this rule to align with the medium density standards.	Reject	*Section 6*
S712.008	Nicholas Fisher and Tammy Pegg	Residential Zones	Support	Retain rule [REr.19U Residential unit - minimum size].	This standard is considered to provide a high degree of flexibility which will serve a diverse range of needs.	Reject	*Section 6*
S719.002	The Domett St/Hardy St/ Tasman St/ Nile St block	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the block of Domett Street/Hardy Street/Tasman Street and Nile Street from Plan Change 29 High Density Residential Zone and it be given the same classification as the other half of Domett Street/Bridge Street block or The Wood area of Residential- Comprehensive Area/Residential Lower Denisty Area with a maximum [height] of two stories.	This area should be removed due to the potential of flooding from the Maitai River and Brook Stream. This area should also be removed because the fault line is going through the middle of the block together with the whole block being in a liquefaction zone. [Refer to the original submission and attachments for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
FS47.007	Wainui Properties Limited		Oppose	Reject	This submission does not adequately recognise the significant opportunity available at 137-155 Nile Street to accommodate residential intensification while enhancing heritage values, mitigating flooding (and other hazard) risks, and without adversely affecting the amenity of adjoining properties. The topography of the site, being on the northern side of Nile Street and having the Brook Stream to the north and Domett Street to the east means the daylight and amenity effects are able to be managed through good planning and design.	Accept	*Section 6*

S732.010	John Fitchett	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the parts of proposed residential zone rules which provide that certain developments are "restricted discretionary" and can be processed with: no "notification"; and neighbour's consent not being required even though they are affected persons. [Application of this submission point to the entire residential zone inferred].	I Oppose: - the parts of proposed Rules REr 19 which provide that certain developments on a site are "restricted discretionary" and specifically with no "notification"; and neighbour's consent not being required even though they are affected persons; - any use under REr.19 which is "restricted discretionary". [The reasons are] that (if implemented) the proposal will affect me, and the amenities I currently enjoy, personally and negatively. (from past experience) I have little or no confidence that Council Planners would decide that the effect of any proposed non-compliance with the proposed new rules, was not "less than minor"; and as a result, would decide that no notification of the proposed non-compliance would be given. Refer to reasons in submission points S732.006 and S732.007 and the original submission for more detail.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.169	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	A great submission and agree with majority of points in their submission and the example at the end is the reason why this plan change is so wrong.	Reject	*Section 6*
S732.011	John Fitchett	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the inclusion of REr.19M requiring 20 % glazing to the street; and request that amendments are made to chapter 7 to reflect	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.170	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	A great submission and agree with majority of points in their submission and the example at the end is the reason why this plan change is so wrong.	Reject	*Section 6*
S732.012	John Fitchett	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Amend REr.19B.3 to have development of more than 3 Units on a site as "Restricted Discretionary" up to 8 Units, but to have anything over 8 Units as "Non-Complying".	Oppose any use under REr.19 which is "restricted discretionary". Refer to reasons in submission points S732.006, S732.007, S732.010 and the original submission for more detail.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS38.028	Small Time Developments		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support in part are: Amend REr.19B.3 to have development of more than 3 Units on a site as "Restricted Discretionary" up to 8 Units, but to have anything over 8 Units as "Non-Complying". Agree that it could be appropriate to create another tier of compliance at 8 units but think this should be discretionary rather that non-complying.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.171	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	A great submission and agree with majority of points in their submission and the example at the end is the reason why this plan change is so wrong.	Reject	*Section 6*
S732.017	John Fitchett	Residential Zones	Oppose	Amend the plan change to reflect opposition to all amendments to existing Objectives and Policies under Chapter 7 which have the effect of supporting a High Density Residential Zone or Medium Density Residential Zone	Refer to reasons in submission points S732.006 and S732.007 and the original submission for more detail.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS83.176	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	A great submission and agree with majority of points in their submission and the example at the end is the reason why this plan change is so wrong.	Reject	*Section 6*
S750.010	Julie Carter	Residential Zones	Oppose	Identify redevelopment opportunities for higher density housing that do not impact on existing single storey residential areas [inferred].	There are many places that could be turned into accommodation, without impacting existing residents in single story character housing. [For example]: Mid City Motel, 218 Trafalgar Street, is for sale. The petrol station opposite the library is no longer being used. The building in progress near Big Save Furniture could also be used for Social Housing. The pensioner flats built adjacent to 59 Wellington Street were built for the elderly and pensioners. However, now there are empty pensioner flats and an empty 3-bedroomedKainga Ora house due for demolition. Why are these places not being used for housing?	Reject	*Section 6*
S754.047	Jan Jordan	Residential Zones	Oppose	The inclusion in PC29 of a maximum height of 10 metres in the areas proposed to be HDZ.	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S754.049	Jan Jordan	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to ensure that any non-compliance with Rules REr.19J (as to height) and/or REr.19K (as to daylight admissions) be considered as "non-complying" - and not as	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*

S754.051	Jan Jordan	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to ensure that failure to comply strictly with all other Rules in Rules REr.19 set out in PC29 will make the proposal "non-complying"	Not stated.	Reject	*Section 6*
S756.003	Lorraine Talley	Residential Zones	Oppose	If the High Density Residential zone remains, make the following changes to the rules and amend/add to the objectives and policies to reflect these changes:: Reduce the maximum height to 10m; Reduce the height at boundary from 12m to 3m; Reduce the recession angle to	Refer to reasons in submission point S756.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S756.007	Lorraine Talley	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose proposed Rule REr 19B.3, 19F.3, 19R.4, and 19S.4 to have certain development on a site as "restricted discretionary" with no "notification" and affected persons consent not being required and Council's discretion being	Refer to reasons in submission point S756.001.	Reject	*Section 6*
S762.001	George Leather	Residential Zones	Oppose	Retain the existing [NRMP] residential zone on Tahunanui Hills.	Oppose medium density and high density residential zone on Tahunanui Hills.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS72.045	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Removal of HDZ on Tahunanui hills Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support Infrastructure isn't relevant to this level of development.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS60.037	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Removal of HDZ on Tahunanui hills. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support: Infrastructure isn't relevant to this level of development.	Reject	*Section 6*
S765.002	Amanda Munting-Kilwarth	Residential Zones	Amend	Reduce the High Denxity (HDZ) height limit to 4 storeys.	My view is the proposed 19.5 (6 storey) height limit is too high in this zone. It will cause shading to neighbours. 4 storey height limit is more appropriate.	Reject	*Section 6*
S770.002	Wainui Properties Limited	Mapping	Support	Retain [High Density] zoning [of the land at 137-155 NileStreet, Nelson City].	The location, scale and attributes of this site make it well suited to High Density zoning.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

FS78.331	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Retain [High Density] zoning [of the land at 137-155 Nile Street, Nelson City]. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new comprehensive independent study of the effects of this proposal on the character and heritage buildings of Nelson that informs changes to proposed rules and policies (on and off-site height, boundary set back, daylight angles). The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS65.376	Heritage Nelson		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission we oppose is: Retain [High Density] zoning [of the land at 137-155 Nile Street, Nelson City]. Reasons include (please also refer to our original submission #831 as in many cases multiple reasons have been noted): In some cases, information is incorrect. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new study on effects of proposals on heritage and character of City. The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice. It has been undertaken by one person rather than a multidisciplinary team.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS78.533	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Various. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences.	Reject	*Section 6*
S770.004	Wainui Properties Limited	Residential Zones	Support	Retain [DO16.1.1.iv High Density Residential Zone description].	The description of the High Density Zone is considered to be appropriate.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS78.535	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Various. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences.	Reject	*Section 6*

S770.005	Wainui Properties Limited	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Amend [Policy RE1.2 Flexibility in development] and associated methods to provide linkage with REr.19C and 19H.	This enabling policy, along with the Comprehensive Housing Development provisions, encouraged innovation and good design. The NRMP also recognised that the site coverage and site area rules needed to be set aside for CHD in recognition of the different forms of development that these provisions encouraged. While the high-density intensions are supported (as set out in policy RE1.8), in the absence of the CHD guideline and associated rules, the enabling standards from PC29 will also lead to associated building forms that will require some flexibility in how some of the performance standards are applied (i.e. site coverage).	Reject	*Section 6*
FS78.536	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Various. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences.	Accept	*Section 6*
S770.006	Wainui Properties Limited	Residential Zones	Support	Retain policy [RE1.8 High Density residential Zones].	This new policy is considered to be appropriate.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS78.537	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Various. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences.	Accept	*Section 6*
S770.011	Wainui Properties Limited	Residential Zones	Support	Retain [Rule REr.19B Residential units].	WPL supports the requirement to provide for accessibility at a rate of 10%. WPL also supports the rule framework in so far as the restricted discretionary activity status is provided, as well as the non-notification and no affected person approvals. This is because of the importance of being able to make confident investment decisions as well as having efficient consent processes.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS78.542	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Various. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences.	Accept	*Section 6*
S770.012	Wainui Properties Limited	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend rule [REr.19C Site coverage] to provide a bespoke definition of site coverage for high density development.	The proposed standard of 50% site coverage is also generally supported as the current 30% standard would lead to an inefficient use of valuable residential land. However, PC29 also removes the current Comprehensive Housing Development (CHD) provisions which set aside the site coverage standard in recognition of providing for flexibility in development and encouraging good design. The CHD provisions also anticipates that good design could lead to shared outdoor living/ amenity space. Given the density enabled by PC29, and the likely format of such housing, it is highly likely that there will be many projects that do not comply with the 50% site coverage and so trigger the discretionary activity classification. This would negate the benefits of PC29 and so needs to be rectified. One way to achieve that would be to provide a bespoke calculation of building coverage for high density development.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS20.014	Tim Bayley		Oppose	Reject	High density development should not be allowed to go over 50% coverage.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS78.543	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Various. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences.	Accept	*Section 6*

S770.013	Wainui Properties Limited	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend rule [REr.19E Other yards] to exclude eaves.	This rule is considered improve the current yard rule however the inclusion of eaves is considered to effectively set most building back at least 600mm further than the 1.0m standard signals. Eaves are considered to have very little impact on amenity values compared to the walls of buildings.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS78.544	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Various. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences.	Accept	*Section 6*
S770.014	Wainui Properties Limited	Residential Zones	Support	Retain [Rule REr.19F Outdoor living court].	This new rule is considered to provide a reasonable requirement for high density living.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS78.545	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Various. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences.	Accept	*Section 6*
S770.015	Wainui Properties Limited	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend rule [REr.19H Permeable landscape area] to take account of 'site' in the context of high-density development.	For the same reasons set out under REr.19C above [refer to submission point S770.012], high density development is highly unlikely to involve a format where each new title would not have 20% permeable landscaped area. Insufficient consideration has therefore been given to the mechanics of this (and other) rules without also proposing a change to the definition of 'site'.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS78.546	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Various. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences.	Accept	*Section 6*

S770.016	Wainui Properties Limited	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend this rule [REr.19J Maximum building height] by reducing the permitted building height to 15m.	If development to the maximum potential scale, this new rule will substantially change the amenity and character of residential areas in the High Density Zone. It is considered that while some sites provide the scale and attributes that provide better capacity to accommodate high density development, the proposed 19.5m permitted building height is not appropriate in particular part of the Nelson setting. As such, WPL seek the opportunity for 15m in height, recognising that Nile Street is also approximately 3.0m higher than the site already. 15m or 4 storey's would then enable 3 storeys above the Nile Street footpath level on this site).	Reject	*Section 6*
FS20.015	Tim Bayley		Oppose	Reject	I do not feel that 4 story development is appropriate on the boundary of Nile St as even with 1 level below grade this means a 3 story apartment or condo building will seriously shade Nile St in the winter ... making this section of road dangerous and icy. Also there are now serious flooding issues for this site ... as the owner state ...."If development to the maximum potential scale, this new rule will substantially change the amenity and character of residential areas in the High Density Zone. It is considered that while some sites provide the scale and attributes that provide better capacity to accommodate high density development, the proposed 19.5m permitted building height is not appropriate in particular part of the Nelson setting. As such, WPL seek the opportunity for 15m in height, recognising that Nile Street is also approximately 3.0m higher than the site already. 15m or 4 storey's would then enable 3 storeys above the Nile Street footpath level on this site)"	Accept	*Section 6*

FS78.547	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Various. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences.	Accept	*Section 6*
S770.017	Wainui Properties Limited	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend this rule [REr.19K Daylight admission] to apply the medium density zone standard contained in REr.18K.	If development to the maximum potential scale, this new rule will substantially change the daylight amenity received on residential sites in the High Density Zone. In conjunction with the reason set out in REr.19J above, it is considered that the medium density daylight admission provision's forming REr.18K would be more appropriate.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS78.548	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Various. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences.	Accept	*Section 6*
S770.018	Wainui Properties Limited	Residential Zones	Support	Retain rule [REr.19L Outlook and privacy].	WPL considers that this proposed rule is reasonable and appropriate.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS78.549	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Various. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences.	Accept	*Section 6*
S770.019	Wainui Properties Limited	Residential Zones	Oppose	Delete rule [REr.19M] and address [glazing to the street frontage] as a part of REr.19B.	While it is accepted that glazing to street frontages is important, it is considered that this would be more appropriately considered (as a matter of restricted discretionary) as a part of REr.19B. This would also then involve consideration of a wider package of design conditions, such as visual privacy and security.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS78.550	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Various. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences.	Accept	*Section 6*
S770.021	Wainui Properties Limited	Residential Zones	Support	Retain rule [REr.19S Maximum building length].	The proposed rule [REr.19S] is supported as it proposed a reasonable and acceptable standard.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS78.552	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Various. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS78.575	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Various. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences.	Accept	*Section 6*
S770.023	Wainui Properties Limited	Residential Zones	Support	Retain rule [REr.19U Residential unit - minimum size].	WPL considers that this proposed rule [REr.19U] is reasonable and appropriate.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS38.030	Small Time Developments		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Retain rule [REr.19U Residential unit - minimum size]. We believe that affordable and effective units can be provided with a smaller minimum size especially when communal facilities are also provided. Ie <30m2 standalone or <20m2 when community facilities provided.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS78.554	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Various. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences.	Accept	*Section 6*

S782.002	MGT Holdings Limited	Mapping	Support	Retain [High Density] zoning [for 113 and 115 Kawai Street, Nelson South].	The location, scale and attributes of this site make it well suited to High Density zoning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S782.004	MGT Holdings Limited	Residential Zones	Support	Retain [DO16.1.1.iv High Density Residential Zone description].	The description of the High Density Zone is considered to be appropriate.	Reject	*Section 6*
S782.005	MGT Holdings Limited	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Amend [Policy RE1.2 Flexibility in development] and associated methods to provide linkage with REr.19C and 19H.	This enabling policy, along with the Comprehensive Housing Development provisions, encouraged innovation and good design. The NRMP also recognised that the site coverage and site area rules needed to be set aside for CHD in recognition of the different forms of development that these provisions encouraged. While the high-density intensions are supported (as set out in policy RE1.8), in the absence of the CHD guideline and associated rules, the enabling standards from PC29 will also lead to associated building forms that will require some flexibility in how some of the performance standards are applied (i.e. site coverage).	Reject	*Section 6*
S782.006	MGT Holdings Limited	Residential Zones	Support	Retain policy [RE1.8 High Density Residential Zones].	This new policy is considered to be appropriate.	Reject	*Section 6*
S782.011	MGT Holdings Limited	Residential Zones	Support	Retain [Rule REr.19B Residential units].	MGT supports the requirement to provide for accessibility at a rate of 10%. MGT also supports the rule framework in so far as the restricted discretionary activity status is provided, as well as the non-notification and no affected person approvals. This is because of the importance of being able to make confident investment decisions as well as having efficient consent processes.	Reject	*Section 6*

S782.012	MGT Holdings Limited	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend rule [REr.19C Site coverage] to provide a bespoke definition of site coverage for high density development.	The proposed standard of 50% site coverage is also generally supported as the current 40% standard would lead to an inefficient use of valuable residential land. However, PC29 also removes the current Comprehensive Housing Development (CHD) provisions which set aside the site coverage standard in recognition of providing for flexibility in development and encouraging good design. The CHD provisions also anticipates that good design could lead to shared outdoor living/ amenity space. Given the density enabled by PC29, and the likely format of such housing, it is highly likely that there will be many projects that do not comply with the 50% site coverage and so trigger the discretionary activity classification. This would negate the benefits of PC29 and so needs to be rectified. One way to achieve that would be to provide a bespoke calculation of building coverage for high density development.	Reject	*Section 6*
S782.013	MGT Holdings Limited	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend rule [REr.19E Other yards] to exclude eaves.	This rule is considered improve the current yard rule however the inclusion of eaves is considered to effectively set most building back at least 600mm further than the 1.0m standard signals. Eaves are considered to have very little impact on amenity values compared to the walls of buildings.	Reject	*Section 6*
S782.014	MGT Holdings Limited	Residential Zones	Support	Retain [Rule REr.19F Outdoor living court].	This new rule is considered to provide a reasonable requirement for high density living.	Reject	*Section 6*
S782.015	MGT Holdings Limited	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend rule [REr.19H Permeable landscape area] to take account of 'site' in the context of high-density development.	For the same reasons set out under REr.19C above [refer to submission point S782.012], high density development is highly unlikely to involve a format where each new title would not have 20% permeable landscaped area. Insufficient consideration has therefore been given to the mechanics of this (and other) rules without also proposing a change to the definition of 'site'.	Reject	*Section 6*

S782.016	MGT Holdings Limited	Residential Zones	Support	Retain rule [REr.19J Maximum building height].	This rule is supported as this part of Nelson is considered to have good capacity to accommodate high density development, with Franklyn Hall already characterising this local area. There are also large buildings within Nelson College to the east and at Nelson Hospital further south.	Reject	*Section 6*
S782.017	MGT Holdings Limited	Residential Zones	Support	Retain rule [REr.19K Daylight admission].	In order to accommodate high density development as provided for under REr.19J it is also important that this rule be retained as proposed.	Reject	*Section 6*
S782.018	MGT Holdings Limited	Residential Zones	Support	Retain rule [REr.19L Outlook and privacy].	It is considered that this proposed rule is reasonable and appropriate.	Reject	*Section 6*
S782.020	MGT Holdings Limited	Residential Zones	Support	Retain rule [REr.19S Maximum building length].	The proposed rule [REr.19S] is supported as it proposed a reasonable and acceptable standard.	Reject	*Section 6*
S782.021	MGT Holdings Limited	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Amend rule [REr.19U Residential unit - minimum size] to provide specifically for retirement villages, either with an exemption or through the inclusion of common indoor spaces when calculating unit areas.	While this rule [REr.19U] is appropriate for most forms of residential activity, it does not provide recognition to retirement village living whereby residents also share indoor living spaces such as in the form of lounges, dining rooms, libraries and recreational areas. It is therefore considered that either an exemption be provided to retirement village forms of residential development, or the rule allows the inclusion of the area (m2) used for other common indoor spaces.	Reject	*Section 6*

S805.008	Lesley Abrey	Mapping	Oppose	[Delete the] HDRZ from the plan completely.	I strongly oppose the High-Density Residential Zone. It is in no way in character or in keeping with any existing Nelson residential suburbs. My concerns are as follows: Loss of privacy and outlook... privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property and many residents have specifically purchased properties because of desirable outlook, mostly paying a premium price for such. Reduction in property values... the value of a property and it's saleability will decrease, because the house becomes less desirable to live in. Increase in on-street car parking... intensification without providing off-street carparking will result in hazards to road users and pedestrians in areas of Nelson where roads are narrow, with little or no footpaths and steep drop offs. Environmental issues... the increased dwelling and occupants put pressure on our local environment in many ways, in particular, water management, i.e. the increasing damage from severe 'weather events' means we should be providing 'natural' landscaping that soaks up excess water rather than advocating for more 'hard' surfaces. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	*Section 6*
S816.009	Joanna Plows	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Requst] apartment buildings have an array of living choices [and unit sizes,] including shared laundry, kitchens, rooftop garden, and recreational areas.	And will apartment buildings have an array of living choices like some in Scandanavia eg units for families, couples and single people. And perhaps a shared laundry and/or kitchen and rooftop garden and recreational area? This would also help with any 'antisocial' behaviour and not having a number of people experiencing problems all living in the same dwelling and affecting neighbours and community as has sometimes been the experience to date.	Reject	*Section 6*

S827.002	Keeley Gerrard	Residential Zones	Oppose	Chapter 7 Residential Zone - Height - 19.5m (6 storeys) should be removed from PC 29.	There is no way possible to make a six storey building look attractive or avoid negative impact on the neighbours and neighbourhood.	Reject	*Section 6*
S829.002	Gabrielle Huygens	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Request for the proposed Examiner Street Kainga Ora development to have] an exterior façade somewhat in keeping with the surrounding area, e.g. not sheerwalled in a low-	Visual impact is extremely important for a large building as it will have a huge presence on the landscape for 80+ years.	Reject	*Section 6*
S829.004	Gabrielle Huygens	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request the proposed Kainga Ora Development on Examiner Street is] not uniformly single rooms [to provide a variety of unit sizes in the new buildings].	Not uniformly single rooms so that there is a mixture of people and lifestyles in each new building. Canadian architect and neuroscientist, Tye Farrow, has spoken on a NZ tour recently about his research, commenting that where one lives has more impact on health and wellbeing than medical interventions. I hope Kainga Ora is well informed about his views and insights.	Reject	*Section 6*
S839.009	Norma Kaa	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Suggests] building small homes, three or four per section, and duplexes.	HDZ - Future slums and concrete jungles, - No car parks, - Nelson on a major fault line, - Lack of sunlight - deprivation of sunlight causes mental health problems, - High rise buildings use more electricity, - Absolute misery for the present home owners as property will be devalued, unable to sell, - No one likes a new multistory building less than 3 metres from your door.	Accept	*Section 6*
S858.013	Catherine Hughson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Oppose] six storey high buildings in the Stoke commercial area.	They are oppressive and will alter the character of the area where a lot of vulnerable elderly live because it is a smaller center., Too much intensification allowed by six story buildings will destroy the current village feel of this community.	Reject	*Section 6*

S860.002	Noah Hosie	Mapping	Oppose	Deletion of the HDZ from PC 29.	I oppose the creation of a High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), in particular [in the location of] Tamaki Street. I oppose the absence of any detailed comment as to the prospective loss in value that properties in the proposed HDZ will suffer if/when a six storey apartment block (with no on-site parking) is built (as of right - with no opportunity for neighbourhood input) 1 metre from the boundary. I oppose the absence of any detailed comment as to the visual and amenity effect on neighbouring properties of permitted height of 19.5 metres and recession plane only commencing at 12 metres. The only "planning" logic in the boundaries/location of the HDZ is proximity to transport and commercial centres. The provisions of the proposed plan change will not provide "cheaper" accommodation for anyone.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S860.003	Noah Hosie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[If the HDZ is not deleted], than a maximum height of 10 metres in the areas proposed to be HDZ.	I oppose any maximum height (in any residential zone) in excess of 10 metres. The justification for the high starting point for recession angles and the degree of such angles becomes irrelevant if the maximum height is 10 metres (or lower). A height of 10 metres allows for two storey houses/apartments - or three storey if designed with expertise and care.	Reject	*Section 6*
S860.005	Noah Hosie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to ensure that any non-compliance with Rules REr.19J (as to height) and/or REr.19K (as to daylight admissions) be considered as "non-complying" - and not as	I oppose the inclusion of "restricted discretionary" in the PC29 in relation to any residential zone.	Reject	*Section 6*
S860.008	Noah Hosie	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to ensure that failure to comply strictly with all other Rules in Rules REr.19 set out in PC29 will make the proposal "non-complying"	I oppose the inclusion of "restricted discretionary" in the PC29 in relation to any residential zone.	Reject	*Section 6*
S872.004	Amanda Young	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	If plan change 29 does go ahead, remove the High Density Residential Zone.	Refer to reasons in submission points S872.001 to 872.003.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
FS83.244	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission and especially regarding historical as I never touched on this.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S878.018	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Residential Zones	Oppose	Reject and oppose [these proposed sections of PC29].	AP22.ii Overview Comprehensive Housing provisions allow for developments to be a restricted discretionary activity (and non-notified) provided the site is located in the Residential Zone - Comprehensive Area. AP22.1 Definitions Comprehensive housing development means three or more residential units, located in the Residential Zone - Comprehensive Area, Standard Area and Lower Density Area only. AP22.2.i I oppose the high density zoning. AP22.8.i I oppose the high density zoning. AP22.8.ii I oppose the high density zoning. AP22.8.iii I oppose the high density zoning.	Reject	*Section 6*
S881.005	Manuka Street Hospital Limited	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Delete the definition of permeable landscape area, along with the rule, or change to 10% as this applies to the Manuka Street Hospital site.	Should the High Density Zone be retained or an alternative zone applied, the requirement for 20% permeable landscape area is opposed. The current MSH site contains 10% of permeable landscaped areas and adding another 10% would result in the loss of valuable land area.	Reject	*Section 6*
S881.009	Manuka Street Hospital Limited	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend RZ.P1 as follows (or words to similar effect): Over time, the appearance and character of neighbourhoods will change as new development occurs, to achieve the planned built character of the zones as described in the objectives and policies. Collectively, General Residential, Medium Density Residential and High Density Residential zones enable a variety of housing densities, in a variety of forms, including detached, semi-detached, terraced housing and apartments. Residential development will be supported by necessary social facilities. In achieving the planned built character of the zone, development will have regard to the	This description goes some way to recognising the changing nature of the urban environment as a result of the NPS-UD but further amendments are required to recognise that existing amenity values need to be viewed in the context of this change.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S881.016	Manuka Street Hospital Limited	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain REr.19E Other yards as notified.	This rule (and new zone) effectively replaces the current yard rule. This rule is supported.	Reject	*Section 6*

S881.018	Manuka Street Hospital Limited	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain rule REr.19J Maximum building height as notified.	The MSHL supports the need for intensification to give effect to the NPS:UD and so also generally supports an increase in building height to help enable that.	Reject	*Section 6*
S888.005	Chris Allison	Residential Zones	Amend	Request reductions to max height. As stated in the Nelsust submission (S608): Reduce maximum permitted building height to 3 stories (11m high) in the High Density Residential Zone.	[I support] 2.3.5 Reductions to Max Heights Requested [from the original Nelsust submission (S608)]. [As stated in the Nelsust submission (S608): The height proposals are surprisingly high, one of the 2 most contentious things in the proposed changes. We think they are unnecessarily high in allowing 6 storeys as of right in high density areas and 4 storeys in medium density areas. While this height might be something we head to in the future, it is a significant shock to a provincial city like Nelson where most houses are only single storey, only a few 2 storey. We ask you to change this to 3 storeys as of right (11m) (with other changes to recession planes - see below) in the high density areas and 2 storeys in the medium (8m). To go higher you should have to apply for a resource consent where things like neighbourhood effects can be taken into account].	Reject	*Section 6*
S888.015	Chris Allison	Residential Zones	Amend	Include affordable zero maintenance apartments for elderly that are sympathetic to their location and its character [inferred].	While I currently live in a single story house and am critical of the approach taken here, the skipping of the local design stage in Nelson's urban development, I won't be here for ever, or even live in this house forever. Like many people of my age there will be a time when a zero maintenance apartment becomes very attractive, so lets have more of them - and not just in cash-cow retirement villages. Some of these apartments could be built [in Tahunanui], sympathetic to their location and its character, with the kind of plan detail changes outlined in the Nelsust submission. Now that would be a smart little city.	Accept in part	*Section 6*

S894.013	The New Zealand Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	Residential Zones	Support	Support the proposed residential zone policy RE1.8 High Density Residential Zone: Efficiently enable high density residential living that increases housing supply and choice on land within close walking distance of the Inner City and Suburban Commercial zones with a planned built character of residential buildings	Refer to reasons in submission point S894.012.	Accept in part	*Section 6*
S898.016	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Residential Zones	Support in part	assessment criteria of REr.18S and REr.19S - Maximum Building Length as follows: Rer.18S.3 Discretion is restricted to visual dominance, privacy and shading effects on neighbouring sites and the functional or operational needs of the activity. Rer.18S.4 Assessment Criteria a. ... b. ... c. ... d. The extent of the functional	The RVA considers that "functional and operational need" should be a matter of discretion when considering any infringements to the maximum building length rule. This is because the functional and operational needs of retirement villages often drive building lengths, however effects can be mitigated through building design.	Reject	*Section 6*
S901.015	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Residential Zones	Support in part	assessment criteria of REr.18S and REr.19S - Maximum Building Length as follows: Rer.18S.3 Discretion is restricted to visual dominance, privacy and shading effects on neighbouring sites and the functional or operational needs of the activity. Rer.18S.4 Assessment Criteria a. ... b. ... c. ... d. The extent of the functional	The RVA considers that "functional and operational need" should be a matter of discretion when considering any infringements to the maximum building length rule. This is because the functional and operational needs of retirement villages often drive building lengths, however effects can be mitigated through building design.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS50.015	MGT Holdings Limited		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: All parts. MGT Holdings fully supports the RVANZ submission and, in particular, the background information providing context to that submission and the relief sought as set out within Appendix 1 of the RVANZ submission.	Reject	*Section 6*
S930.001	Dorothy Griffiths	Residential Zones	Oppose	Re-allocate the site on 81 Neale Ave to housing for the elderly.	I object to the plan for intensified and social housing for the Stoke area. The vast majority who reside in this area are pensioners. They choose to live there because they want peaceful, safe living, close to the amenities it offers, catering for the elderly. Scooters, skate boards and souped-up cars do not mix well with zimmer frames, wheelchairs and frail elderly folk who deserve to feel safe in their living environment.	Reject	*Section 6*

S931.001	Norma Affleck	Residential Zones	Oppose	Please consider that [Neale Ave, Stoke is] used to house the elderly and young families.	I am an elderly resident who purposely downsized to a property in Neale Ave Stoke. It was chosen for it safe, quiet, and close proximity to amenities and bus routes area. The majority of residents in this area are pensioners and young families. My concerns about crowding social housing into this prime real estate site in Neale Ave would render this area less safe for the majority of these residents. My fear is that I am being forced into a gated retirement village where I would loose the independence I strive to maintain.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.073	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amendments [to REr.19B.1] sought: Development of up to three residential units on a site is a permitted activity, ~~provided that the development complies with all the permitted conditions in this Rule Table.~~	Kainga Ora supports the permitted rule (REr.19B.1) enabling up to 3 units. However, amendment is sought as compliance is concurrently tied to complying with all conditions in the "rule table". This proviso is unnecessary as compliance with each condition is separately managed through other rules.	Accept	*Section 6*
FS73.145	EQC Toka Tū Ake		Oppose	Reject	The submitter (Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities) requests removing the Rule Table which provides context for what development complies with the permitted, controlled, discretionary and restricted conditions. We disagree with the removal of reference to the Rule Table in the suggested amendments to REr17B.1 because it helps provides a clear approach to which rules apply.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.074	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain remaining rule framework at REr.19B.3.	Kainga Ora supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status (REr.19B.3) where 4 or more units are proposed, subject to meeting accessibility conditions. Kainga Ora supports the notification preclusion that applies to REr.19B.3.	Reject	*Section 6*

S933.075	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Delete REr.19B.3 a) and b).	Kainga Ora does not support the requirement to include 10% wheelchair accessible units where 10+ units are provided for within REr.19B.3. Kainga Ora consider this requirement as too restrictive if not a desired option for that specific development and adds additional cost and reduction in space. Kainga Ora consider that this design aspect is best left as a choice for a developer and the market that is being targeted.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.077	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support	Retain rule [REr.19D] framework as notified.	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.19D Front Yards] framework in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.078	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support	Retain rule [REr.19E] framework as notified.	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.19E Other Yards] framework in its entirety.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.079	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend rule [REr.19F] to delete clause d) and e).	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.19F Outdoor Living Court] framework, including the notification preclusion statement, however, does not support clause d) or e) as this is considered too restrictive.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.080	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support	Retain rule [REr.19G] framework as notified, but include notification preclusions.	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.19G Corner Sites] framework; but seeks amendment to include notification preclusions (both public and limited notification) where compliance is not achieved, as infringement to this standard would be assessed by relevant traffic experts and notification would not benefit the consent process.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.081	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain rule [REr.19H] framework as notified, but include notification preclusions.	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.19H Permeable landscaped area] framework; but seeks amendment to include notification preclusions (both public and limited notification) where compliance is not achieved.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.082	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Amend REr.19J.1 as follows: The maximum permitted height for buildings is ~~19.5m~~ 22m.	Kainga Ora consider that a height of 22m is more appropriate within the high density zone to properly allow for 6 storeys. A height of 22m allows for minimum floor level and floor to ceiling height and design variations.	Reject	*Section 6*

S933.083	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	~~Amend REr.19K.1 as follows: Buildings are~~ permitted if: a. they do not project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point: i. 19m ~~12m~~ above ground level along all side and rear boundaries with 23.5m from the road frontage; and ii. 8m ~~4m~~ above ground level along all other	Kainga Ora supports, in part, the more enabling height in relation to boundary provisions for the High Density Zone. However, Kainga Ora seeks the following changes to [REr.19K Daylight admission to] better enable flexibility in design choice for developments.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.084	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain rule [REr.19L] framework as notified, but include notification preclusions Amendments sought [to REr.19L.3] as follows: Activities that contravene a permitted condition are restricted discretionary. Discretion is restricted to: iv. effects on the quality of on- site living environments; and~~privacy effects on neighbouring sites;~~	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.19L Outlook and privacy] framework; but seeks amendment to include notification preclusions (both public and limited notification) where compliance is not achieved. Kainga Ora also seeks amendment from the matters of discretion, to remove privacy effects on neighbouring sites. This Standard is an onsite amenity control, with other standards managing offsite amenity outcomes (e.g. setbacks, height, height in relation to boundary controls).	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.085	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain rule [REr.19M] framework as notified, but include notification preclusions.	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.19M Glazing to the street] framework; but seeks amendment to include notification preclusions (both public and limited notification) where compliance is not achieved. This rule seeks to manage the interface with the street (positive design and passive surveillance) and notification would not benefit the consent process.	Reject	*Section 6*
S933.087	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain rule [REr.19S] framework as notified, but include notification preclusions.	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.19S Building Length] framework; but seeks amendment to include notification preclusions (both public and limited notification) where compliance is not achieved.	Reject	*Section 6*

S933.088	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Oppose	1. Delete 8m height limit [in rule REr.19T]. 2. Amend assessment criteria (REr.19T.4) to incorporate a significance of heritage building into the assessment.	Kainga Ora does not support the proposed 8m height restriction pertaining to [REr.19T] buildings adjoining a historic heritage precinct or scheduled building. The scope of discretion in regards to the effect on historic heritage values is too broad, and would likely lead to undue consenting burdens in the application of this rule. Applying a blanket 8m height limit is a blunt tool for protecting heritage values.	Reject	*Section 6*

S940.001	Mitchell Hutchings	Mapping	Amend	Consolidate the High Density Residential Zone to the CBD and close surrounding areas, and replace with medium density in the areas of town that have the infrastructure to support high density developments.	I believe more consideration needs to be given to the 'high density residential zone' and the vast areas of the city that are included in this proposed zone. While I support the increased development of existing hazard free residential zones and do partially support the efforts NCC are making, I believe that allowing six storey developments in existing one or two storey development areas is too drastic of a change. The proposed high density residential zone appears to have been included in PC29 without full consideration of the impacts of what this type of development would have on the adjoining people who occupy this land, namely their access to reasonable amounts of sunlight... While I understand the need for intensified brownfield development, medium density development across the board (in all areas earmarked for medium and high density) would easily accommodate the future brownfield growth needs of Nelson should all properties be developed to the full extent of the proposed medium density provisions. This means that the high density residential zones should be consolidated to where they are needed and where high density development should be encouraged in Nelson - in the CBD and close surrounding areas. The medium density residential provisions are the rules intended to be applied to the Nelson City residential zones in the National Policy Statement for Urban Development as a Teir 2 City. Teir I Cities (in the right parts of the city) can accommodate higher density development, but this should only be applied in areas where it is realistic to expect this kind of development. Applying high density rules to fragmented pieces of residential land will only put off potential home buyers and push them toward purchasing land where there is some certainty their sunlight won't be impeded by development -this will often mean purchasing land in hazard prone areas which are more affordable (Tahunanui, The Wood, on hills across town) which is contrary to what PC29 is seeking to	Reject	*Section 6*

S940.003	Mitchell Hutchings	Mapping	Oppose in part	Change the zone of Rimu Street, Toi Toi from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Rimu Street in Toi Toi should be changed to 'medium density residential zone' as it is the only street in the high density zone that does not have a formalised footpath or grass verge and I don't not believe it can safely accommodate the potential additional pedestrian and cyclists. Rimu Street is currently formed to a narrow formation given the amount of development on the street comparatively to similar streets in the proposed high density residential zone. Rimu Street is 8 metres wide and currently serves 19 dwellings. The street has no formalised parking, no footpaths and no grass verges on either side of the carriageway. Had this been a proposed subdivision under the current provisions of the NTLDM, a minimum width legal road corridor of 13 metres would need to be provided comprising a 1.5 metre wide footpath and two 1.6 metre wide service strips. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	*Section 6*
S947.015	Nelson City Council	Residential Zones	Support in part	Consider amended provisions [Chapter 7 Residential] such as building height restrictions or height in relation to boundary rules for sites that directly adjoin public open spaces that are vulnerable to adverse effects from high density development (including but not limited to smaller open spaces and parks containing heritage trees vulnerable to wind).	P29 allows for intensification but it does not specifically manage the potential adverse effects of taller buildings on the function and amenity of public open spaces, particularly smaller public open spaces (e.g. Hallowell Cemetery and Wellington Reserve). These potential adverse effects include shading of publicly accessible areas and wind conditions. Maintaining a quality network of public open spaces will be important to provide for the social well-being and recreational needs of residents in the future.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS5.001	Warwick Rogers		Support in part	Accept in part	This needs to be extended to every private property. It's disgustingly unfair that the council wants to shade peoples homes, but admits in their own submission that they need to make allowances for public spaces as they will be negatively affected.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS31.021	Stephen Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: The potential adverse effects of shading and high wind effect from taller buildings on smaller open spaces and trees. This should be extended to the protection of ALL residential properties from ALL taller buildings (not limited to public spaces and HDRZ) for the social well-being of ALL residents. All trees can be vulnerable to excessive wind as a result of the venturi effect caused by taller buildings increasing wind velocity and damaging down wash vortices.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS20.002	Tim Bayley		Oppose	Reject	This is absolutely ironic that NCC Planners suddenly find the draconian daylight angles that you want to subject all nelson existing residents to will actually cause detrimental shading on your own parks .... the very parks were residents will want to come to get some sun in winter to stave of bad cases of riccets from lack of sunshine ... wow imagine your precious parks surrounded by 6 story apartments 1 m from the boundary !!! Just like you want to impose on the rest of us for NO GOOD REASON !!	Accept	*Section 6*
FS72.021	Jude Osborne		Support in part	Accept in part	The Particular Part of the submission I support: The potential adverse effects of shading and high wind effect from taller buildings on smaller open spaces and trees. This should be extended to the protection of ALL residential properties from ALL taller buildings (not limited to public spaces and HDRZ) for the social well-being of ALL residents.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS66.023	Carol Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: The potential adverse effects of shading and high wind effect from taller buildings on smaller open spaces and trees. This should be extended to the protection of ALL residential properties from ALL taller buildings (not limited to public spaces and HDRZ) for the social well-being of ALL residents. All trees can be vulnerable to excessive wind as a result of the venturi effect caused by taller buildings increasing wind velocity and damaging down wash vortices.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS61.021	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: The potential adverse effects of shading and high wind effect from taller buildings on smaller open spaces and trees. This should be extended to the protection of ALL residential properties from ALL taller buildings (not limited to public spaces and HDRZ) for the social well-being of ALL residents.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS76.021	Robert Stevenson(1)		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: The potential adverse effects of shading and high wind effect from taller buildings on smaller open spaces and trees. This should be extended to the protection of ALL residential properties from ALL taller buildings (not limited to public spaces and HDRZ) for the social well-being of ALL residents. All trees can be vulnerable to excessive wind as a result of the venturi effect caused by taller buildings increasing wind velocity and damaging down wash vortices.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS54.021	Nicole Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: The potential adverse effects of shading and high wind effect from taller buildings on smaller open spaces and trees. This should be extended to the protection of ALL residential properties from ALL taller buildings (not limited to public spaces and HDRZ) for the social well-being of ALL residents.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS53.021	Susan Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: The potential adverse effects of shading and high wind effect from taller buildings on smaller open spaces and trees. This should be extended to the protection of ALL residential properties from ALL taller buildings (not limited to public spaces and HDRZ) for the social well-being of ALL residents.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS46.021	Dan McGuire		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: The potential adverse effects of shading and high wind effect from taller buildings on smaller open spaces and trees. This should be extended to the protection of ALL residential properties from ALL taller buildings (not limited to public spaces and HDRZ) for the social well-being of ALL residents.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS57.015	Susan Hamilton and David Macdonald		Support in part	Accept	The submission details "the potential adverse effects of taller buildings on the function around amenity of public open spaces" - these include "shading of publicly accessible areas and wild effects". If it is of value to protect public reserves that are used intermittently and by choice, then it is vastly more important to protect privately owned residential properties that are lived in and enjoy the current sunshine and environment 24/7.	Reject	*Section 6*

FS77.021	Harry Pearson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: The potential adverse effects of shading and high wind effect from taller buildings on smaller open spaces and trees. This should be extended to the protection of ALL residential properties from ALL taller buildings (not limited to public spaces and HDRZ) for the social well-being of ALL residents. Wherever possible open spaces and trees should be given as much protection as residents properties but they shouldn't be given more protection i.e. It is ridiculous if PC29 enables developers to shade neighbouring properties and take away the neighbouring properties' ability to grow their own food (have a vegetable garden and fruit trees) and generate their own solar power while at the same time protecting open spaces and trees from the loss of sunlight.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS58.021	Robert Stevenson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: The potential adverse effects of shading and high wind effect from taller buildings on smaller open spaces and trees. This should be extended to the protection of ALL residential properties from ALL taller buildings (not limited to public spaces and HDRZ) for the social well-being of ALL residents.	Reject	*Section 6*
FS60.021	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: The potential adverse effects of shading and high wind effect from taller buildings on smaller open spaces and trees. This should be extended to the protection of ALL residential properties from ALL taller buildings (not limited to public spaces and HDRZ) for the social well-being of ALL residents. All trees can be vulnerable to excessive wind as a result of the venturi effect caused by taller buildings increasing wind velocity and damaging down wash vortices.	Reject	*Section 6*